SHOUT
SHARE
IT

S. 2702.
5.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 5

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950—1959

(*All rights reserved*)

FOREWORD

by

The Lord Hurcomb,

Chairman of the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

In anticipation of the proposed publication in future of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in a simpler and less expensive form—thereby complying with the wish expressed by the recently closed Fifteenth International Congress of Zoology—the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature has had under consideration the arrangements to be made for completing certain of the older volumes of the *Bulletin*.* The earliest of the volumes concerned is Volume 5, the volume allotted to the publication of the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948 and the Reports on matters of nomenclature submitted to that Congress. The whole of this volume was published in 1950 with the exception of the concluding Part which was reserved for a Report prepared by the Secretary on the measures taken to keep the Commission alive during the World War of 1939–1945 and on the financial developments which had occurred during that period. Mr. Hemming has explained that the reason why this concluding Part of the present volume was not published was that with the limited amount of time which as Honorary Secretary he could then devote to the work of the Commission he had taken the view that it would be better to concentrate on the publication of Parts of the *Bulletin* containing new applications on individual problems of nomenclature submitted to the Commission for decision and this is what he did. In the altered circumstances of the present time Mr. Hemming has suggested that the needs of the case would be met if there were now to be published a concluding Part containing a much abridged version of the Report submitted to the Paris Congress, together with the audited accounts for the period in question. The Trust accepted this proposal and invited Mr. Hemming to prepare the proposed document. This he very kindly undertook to do. The document so prepared is published in the present concluding Part, together with a title-page, thus making possible at last the binding of this volume.

(signed) **HURCOMB**

Office of the International Trust
for Zoological Nomenclature,
41 Queen's Gate,
LONDON, S.W.7.

2nd September 1958.

---

*The other volumes here referred to by the Chairman of the Trust are Volumes 14, 15 and 16. These have now all been completed and the concluding Parts of each published.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

For reasons similar to those explained overleaf by Lord Hurcomb in relation to the Secretary's Report to the Paris Congress on the work of the Commission in the period 1936–1948, it has been decided to dispense with the Subject Index previously proposed to be included in the present volume.

Accordingly on the last page (: xxi) of the Table of Contents published in Triple-Part 1/3 in 1950 the words "Alphabetical Subject Index" should now be deleted.

In addition to the foregoing, the following action should also be taken :—

page xxi, last line : insert at end of line the page number " 194 ".

page xxi, immediately after the above entry : insert the following words and page number :—" Instructions to Binders . . . 194 "

(initialled) F.H.

25*th March* 1959.

PURCHASED
21 AUG 1959

BRITISH MUSEUM
NATURAL HISTORY
ZOOLOGY

VOLUME 5. Parts 1/3 7th July, 1950
pp. TP.-xxi, Half-Title, (1)-62.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED
14 JUL 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

Page

Title Page; Thanks to U.N.E.S.C.O.; Composition of Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948; Foreword by the Secretary-General to the Congress; Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the Official Publication of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and of the Reports submitted to the Congress; Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the Class and Ordinal Names used in the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature; Table of Contents — TP.—xxi

Part 1. *The Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July* 1948: Minutes of the First Meeting and first instalment of the Minutes of the Second Meeting — Half-Title, (1)-62

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

14 JUL

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 5

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

(All rights reserved)

Printed in Great Britain
by METCHIM & SON, LTD.,
at their Press at 8, Princes St.,
Westminster, London, S.W.1.

PART 1.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

OF THE

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

OF ZOOLOGY

HELD IN

PARIS IN JULY 1948

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION — U.N.E.S.C.O. — for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, Paris, JULY 1948

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

The following members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology attended meetings of the Section on Nomenclature :—

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)

M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
M. Belloc (France)
Senor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
M. H. Berthet (France)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Professor Ernest N. Cory (U.S.A.)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France)
Professor A. Ghigi (Italy)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. H. A. F. Gohar (Egypt)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Professor W. P. Hayes (U.S.A.)
Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom)
M. Denis Jacques (France)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Dr. S. di Toledo Piza (Brazil)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
M. G. Ranson (France)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)
Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

The following also attended meetings of the Section:

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

FOREWORD

by the

SECRETARY-GENERAL

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

Antérieurement, les competes-rendus des séances de la Section de Nomenclature des Congreès de Zoologie étaient inclus dans les Comptes-rendus de ces Congrès. Il n'a pas été possible de faire de même lors du Congrès de Paris en 1948 : les séances de la Section, très bien remplies, ont fait l'objet de Comptes-rendus particulièrement volumineux dont la rédaction demandait beaucoup de temps et dont la publication entrainait à de grandes dépenses. De sorte que le Bureau du Congrès de Zoologie a dû demander à Mr. Francis Hemming de bien vouloir réserver la publication de ces Comptes-rendus pour le " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature".

A cette occasion, je suis heureux d'exprimer à Mr. Hemming mes félicitations pour le très gros travail de préparation qu'il a effectué avant le Congrès, pour la grande activité de la Section de Nomenclature déployée pendant le Congrès et pour l'importance des résultats obtenus et des décisions prises.

Le Secrétaire Général du Congrès de Zoologie de 1948

E. FISCHER-PIETTE,
Professeur au Museum.

XIIIe Congrès International de Zoologie,
Secrétariat Général : 55, Rue de Buffon,
Paris Ve.

le 17 *janvier*, 1950.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE, THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948, AND OF THE REPORTS SUBMITTED THEREBY FOR APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS IN PLENARY SESSION

Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature

The proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July 1948 differ from those at all previous Congresses by reason of the wide area covered by the work preformed and the very large number of the decisions taken. The Section held no less than six meetings, each meeting being held concurrently with a meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. At these meetings a very large number of conclusions was reached in regard to the amendment, clarification and amplification of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, on which it was unanimously agreed that recommendations should be submitted to the Congress for approval in Plenary Session. In addition, the Section, in agreement with the Commission, formulated a long series of recommendations relating to the reform of the composition and procedure of the Commission and matters related thereto. Finally, the Section participated in discussions in the Commission in regard to a large number of individual questions of zoological nomenclature and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in these cases. In another respect also, the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature in Paris differed from those of meetings of the Section at previous Congresses, for at Paris, for the first time, the Section, as also the Commission, were supplied with an extensive series of documents to assist them in the consideration of the large number of important and complex issues which it was their duty to consider.

2. In these circumstances it was inevitable that the Report prepared by the Commission and submitted to the Congress by the Section, on its own behalf and on that of the Commission should be far more comprehensive and detailed than any Report similarly submitted to a previous Congress. In addition to the main Report reciting the principal developments which had occurred since the last previous Congress, the Congress of Lisbon of 1935, and dealing with the work performed during the Paris Congress, two further Reports were submitted to that Congress by the Section on Nomenclature. The first of these Reports, prepared by the Secretary to the Commission, contained a detailed account of the numerous and complex administrative and financial problems which had arisen in the administration of the affairs of the Commission during the long period of thirteen years which had elapsed since the Congress held at Lisbon in 1935. The second of these Reports dealt with a single problem of zoological nomenclature, the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles Internationales*, a subject on which at the Final Plenary Session of the Twelfth (Lisbon) Congress the Commission had been instructed to prepare a Report for consideration by the

Thirteenth Congress, the Lisbon Congress hoping that by this means it would be possible to overcome certain difficulties which had arisen in regard to this matter at the Eleventh Congress held at Padua in 1930.

3. The Section on Nomenclature at Paris agreed, *inter alia*, to recommend that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature should be requested by the Congress in Plenary Session to publish in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" the minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature (and also those of the International Commission), together with the three Reports which the Section had agreed to submit to the Congress. This recommendation was approved by the Congress at the Final Plenary Session held at the Sorbonne on Tuesday, 27th July 1948. Immediately after the close of the Congress, this request was conveyed to the International Trust, which thereupon decided to allot the present volume (volume 5) of the "Bulletin" for the publication of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and of the three Reports submitted to the Congress.

4. On the occasion of previous International Congresses of Zoology, the Minutes of the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, together with the Report that had been prepared by the Commission and submitted, with the authority of the Section on Nomenclature, to the Congress for approval, have been published in the volume containing the official *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress prepared by the Secretary-General. On the present occasion it was considered by the Secretary-General of the Congress, after consultation with the President, that the publication of these records *in extenso* in the official *Comptes Rendus* would involve an unjustifiably heavy expense, having regard to the fact that, at the request of the Congress, the whole of these documents was to be published by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature". In these circumstances it was decided by the authorities of the Congress not to publish the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature in the *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress and, as regards the Reports submitted to the Congress by the Section, to publish only extracts from the principal Report relating to the work performed during the Paris Congress, notes being added at appropriate points in the *Comptes Rendus* drawing the attention of members of the Congress to the fact that arrangements had been made for the publication of the full text of these records in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature". This arrangement was concurred in by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, which thus, at the request of the authorities of the Congress, assumed sole responsibility for the publication of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and of the full text of the Reports submitted by the Section on Nomenclature to that Congress.

5. In view both of the heavy expenditure and of the large amount of additional work which would have been involved, it was not considered that it would be reasonable to ask the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature to follow, in relation to the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, a procedure similar to that which they had agreed to adopt in relation to the Minutes of the Meetings of the International Commission on Zoological

Nomenclature, that is, to submit by airmail, for approval, a copy of the draft of the Minutes for approval to each of the members of the Congress by whom the meetings had been attended. Nor was it considered that, apart from the question of expense, there would have been any call for such a procedure in the case of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, having regard to the fact that, in spite of the wide range and large number of matters discussed by the Section, there had been absolute unanimity on every matter dealt with by the Section, with the exception of one individual nomenclatorial case (relating to the relative advantages of the use of the name *Bilharzia* on the one hand and that of *Schistosoma* on the other hand), as regards which a note that the decision taken was not unanimous had been duly recorded in the Minutes. In agreement with the authorities of the Congress it was accordingly decided that the needs of the case would be fully met if the International Trust were to send, by airmail, for approval, the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature to each of the Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who had attended the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature, thereby ensuring that the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings held jointly between the Section and the Commission should be subjected to careful simultaneous scrutiny. A request in this sense was submitted to, and approved by, the International Trust. As soon therefore as proofs were received from the printer, copies of the draft of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature were despatched by airmail (on 9th December 1949) to all the Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who attended the Paris Congress, with a request that the draft should be carefully examined for the purpose of ensuring that it represented a true and accurate record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology.

6. In due course replies were received from all the Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who had attended the Paris Congress, with the exception of Commissioner Paul Rode (France) who had died not long after the close of the Congress and Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico).* The fourteen (14) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners from whom replies were received all approved the draft of the Minutes of the Section, subject, in one or two cases, to minor drafting or typographical corrections, all of which have been incorporated in the final text of the Minutes. The Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners by whom, under the arrangements approved by the Authorities of the Congress, the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature have been approved are: H. Boschma (Netherlands); J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.); L. di Caporiacco (Italy); Francis Hemming (United Kingdom); E. Hindle (United Kingdom); A. R. Jorge (Portugal); Harold Kirby (U.S.A.); Henning Lemche (Denmark); K. Mansour (Egypt); Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.); N. D. Riley (United Kingdom); R. Spärck (Denmark); V. van Straelen (Belgium); Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.).

7. For the reasons already explained (in paragraph 4 above) the present volume is the sole place of publication of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and of the Reports submitted by the Section, in agreement with the

* See Postscript on page xii.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to the Congress for approval in Plenary Session. Through the kindness of the Secretary-General, it has been possible to include in the present volume (page 131) an extract from the *Comptes Rendus* of the Congress containing the official record of the approval of the recommendations submitted jointly by the Section on Nomenclature and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, signified by the Congress at the Final Plenary Session held at the Sorbonne on Tuesday, 27th July 1948.

8. The terms of the present note have been agreed between Professor E. Fischer-Piette, *Secretary-General, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology*, and myself, as *President of the Section on Nomenclature*.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

1*st February* 1950

Postscript dated 13th June, 1950

I have today received by airmail a letter, dated 9th June 1950, in which, after explaining that until a few weeks ago he had been away from Mexico City and inaccessible for mail, Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) stated that he had now examined the draft of the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature and found himself in full agreement with the text submitted.

2. With the receipt of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán's letter, replies have now been received from all the fifteen (15) Members and Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who attended the Meetings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948. The Minutes, as now published, have accordingly been approved by all those to whom, under the arrangements approved by the Authorities of the Congress, the draft of those Minutes was submitted for approval.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948

CLASS AND ORDINAL NAMES USED IN THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECTION OF NOMENCLATURE OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948

Note by the President of the Section on Nomenclature

At their Fifth Meeting held at the Sorbonne on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 1730 hours, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology approved a recommendation submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that an intensive study of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the category Sub-Order, should be made by the Secretary to the International Commission in conjunction with interested specialists, with a view to the submission by that Officer of a comprehensive Report, with recommendations, to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, and proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* by that Congress of provisions relating to this matter. While, therefore, there are at present no rules governing the naming of Classes, Orders and other categories above the family level, the possibility of including in the *Règles* provisions relating to this range of names will be considered by the next International Congress when it meets in Copenhagen in 1953.

2. Thus, in preparing the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress, I was not able to look to the *Règles* for guidance on the question of the names to be used to indicate the position in the Animal Kingdom of the genera and species, the names of which had been considered by the Section. If only to facilitate the task of literature-recording serials such as the *Zoological Record*, it was clearly desirable that some indication on this subject should be given in the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature. In these circumstances, it appeared to me that the best course to adopt would be that followed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in submitting its recommendations and conclusions in regard to the generic and specific trivial names which they had considered, that is, to use, as a matter of convenience Class and Ordinal Names applied to the genera and species concerned by the Secretary to the Commission, when placing the cases before them. The advantage of this course resides in the fact that it secures a reasonable degree of uniformity, while not in any way committing the Section on Nomenclature in favour of one name, as contrasted with another, in those cases where unhappily, owing to the lack of provisions in the *Règles* on this subject, two or more names are commonly used to denote a single Class or Order.

3. It will be clear from the foregoing explanation that the use in the Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of any given Class or

Ordinal Name does not imply that any special mark of approval has thereby been given by the Congress to that name as against some other name for the taxonomic unit concerned.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

President of the Section on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, July 1948

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

26*th January* 1950.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY HELD IN PARIS IN JULY 1948

(*published at the request of the Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie*)

MINUTES of the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Eighth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

		Page
1.	Procedure to be adopted by the Section on Nomenclature during its Paris Session	1
2.	Emendation of *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827, to *Psolos* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera)	3
3.	Extension and incorporation in the *Règles* of the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ..	5
4.	Proposed incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision establishing a Law of Prescription limiting the scope of the Law of Priority	13
5.	Nomenclature of Protozoan and other parasites of Man	19
6.	Meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles*	23
7.	Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: date and time appointed	26

MINUTES of the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948 at 0900 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Tenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

1.	Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level	28
2.	Nomenclature of Families and Sub-Families	29
3.	Proposed recognition of the concepts " grade " and " pseudogenus "	30

Second Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

4. Nomenclature of fossil fragments of the kind known as organites and sclerites in invertebrates 31

5. Propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet: procedure proposed in regard to 32

6. Proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in Clerck, 1757, *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding that that work was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature 33

7. Work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period 1935–1948 36

8. Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on action taken at its present (Paris) Session in regard to matters of personnel and recommendations on such matters submitted to the Congress for approval 47

9. Despatch of a telegram to Dr. Karl Jordan offering him the Office of Honorary Life President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 54

10. Thanks to UNESCO for financial assistance granted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 54

11. Thanks to donors of contributions to the funds of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 55

12. Communication addressed to the Congress on behalf of the Austrian zoologists 55

13. Amendment of the *Règles:* proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: 56

    (i) The programme for the reform of the *Règles* advocated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 57

    (ii) The recommendations of the Commission regarding the method to be adopted to give effect to the decisions of the Congress for the reform of the *Règles* 58

    (iii) Meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25 59

    (iv) Proposed establishment of rules governing the naming of infra-subspecific forms 60

    (v) The Law of Homonymy in relation to the names of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms 63

Second Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

13. Amendment of the *Règles:* proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (*continued*)

(vi) Codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in *Opinions* and of the resolutions incorporated in the Commission's *Declarations* 67

(vii) Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* 69

(a) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 6 69

(b) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Papers I.C. (48) 11 & 13 70

(c) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 12 70

(d) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 14 72

(e) Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 15 73

14. Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: date and time appointed 75

Appendix to Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature

Correspondence between the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948, and the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna:

(a) Communication addressed by the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna and other Austrian zoologists to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (communication handed to the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the opening day of the Congress) 77

(b) Letter (Z.N.(G.)36) dated 29th July, 1948, from the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948, to the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna 78

MINUTES of the Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 0930 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Eleventh Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

		Page
1.	Apology by the President for late arrival	81
2.	Programme for the Meetings to be held during Monday, 26th July, 1948	82
3.	Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	83
4.	Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche as the Danish Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	83
5.	Report to the Congress submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	84
6.	Proposal that the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie* be asked to propose to the Congress a Resolution to be sent to UNESCO stressing the extreme importance of the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ..	89
7.	Fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* (Paper I.C. (48) 16): procedure proposed in regard to	90
8.	Seventeen proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*	91
9.	*Necator* Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda): validation of erroneous entry in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*	93
10.	Applications relating to certain generic names in the Phylum Mollusca	93
11.	Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: time appointed ..	94

MINUTES of the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1445 hours.

(Meeting held concurrently with the Twelfth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

1.	Procedure to be adopted during the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature	95

Fourth Meeting (*continued*) Page

2. Type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda) 96
3. Communications announced but not yet made to the Section: procedure to be adopted in regard to 98
4. Proposals relating to three individual nomenclatorial problems .. 98
5. Fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* (Paper I.C. (48) 17) 100
6. Sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* (Paper I.C. (48) 18) 101
7. Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: time appointed .. 103

MINUTES of the Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 1730 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Thirteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

1. Eight applications on individual cases submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Namenclature (Paper I.C. (48) 19) 104
2. Two applications published in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 105
3. Eighteen applications published in Part 8 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 106
4. Twenty-three applications published in Part 9 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 108
5. Report to the Congress: supplementary items 110
6. Sixth (and Final) Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature: time appointed 111

MINUTES of the Sixth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948 at 2030 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fourteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

1. Fourteen applications published in Part 10 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 112

Sixth Meeting (*continued*) *Page*

2. Seventeen applications published in Part 11 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" 113

3. Twenty-one applications submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by individual specialists 115

4. Article 25: additional provisions relating to trivial names which, prior to being published in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, were either manuscript names or *nomina nuda* .. 118

5. Authorship of new names and method to be adopted in citing authors' names: supplementary provisions 119

6. Approval of certain recommendations embodied in notes attached to re-issues of old *Opinions* or as appendices to new *Opinions* .. 120

7. Re-issue of the older of the *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: arrangements for .. 120

8. Nomenclature of the human malaria parasites 121

9. "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology": supplementary decisions regarding 122

10. Editorial Committee charged with the duty of editing the revised text of the *Règles*: composition of 123

11. Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: insertion of a reference to the composition of the Editorial Committee and other matters 124

12. International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: internal procedure during inter-Congress periods 125

13. Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Paris Session: arrangements for securing an agreed text 125

14. Thanks of the Section on Nomenclature to the members of the Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 125

15. Rising Vote of Thanks to Mr. Francis Hemming for his conduct of the Office of President of the Section on Nomenclature 126

16. Vote of Thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress and to the Authorities of the Congress generally 128

17. Close of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 128

PART 2.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT ITS FINAL PLENARY SESSION HELD IN PARIS ON 27th JULY, 1948

(extracts relating to zoological nomenclature)

Page

Extraits de la Séance de Clôture 131

PART 3.

REPORTS SUBMITTED JOINTLY BY THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE AND BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE TO THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT ITS FINAL PLENARY SESSION HELD IN PARIS ON 27th JULY, 1948

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology 135

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the use of the expression "nomenclature binaire" in the "Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique" 152

Report by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the work of the Secretariat of the Commission during the period 1936–1948 169

Alphabetical Subject Index.

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts of the present Volume.

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the First Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 0900 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Eighth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
M. H. Berthet (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Procedure to be adopted by the Section on Nomenclature during Paris Meeting

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at former meetings of the Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had normally completed its deliberations shortly after the opening of the Congress the Commission having assembled for this purpose some days before the Congress opened. This procedure had certain advantages but it suffered from the objection that it rendered it impossible for the Commission to work closely with the members of the Congress, few of whom arrived at the seat of the Congress until the

eve of the opening day. On the present occasion the Commission had not been able to hold preliminary meetings of this kind. On the other hand, exceptionally far-reaching measures had been taken to prepare the Agenda for the meeting of the Commission, a large series of important papers having been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the important questions awaiting consideration. To facilitate that consideration the Commission had agreed to suspend their By-Laws for the duration of the present Session. These measures, coupled with a high sense of responsibility on the part of the members of the Commission regarding the importance and urgency of many of the nomenclatorial questions awaiting decision, had enabled the Commission to make rapid progress during the seven meetings which had already been held. In large part this result had been secured as the result of a decision taken on the opening day that all the meetings of the Commission should be held in public. This decision represented a complete break with the former practice of the Commission but had been fully justified both by the opportunity which it had afforded to the Commission to bring other specialists into consultation and by the fact that it had enabled members of the Congress who were interested in questions of zoological nomenclature actively to participate in the preparation of the proposals which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section. Most of the members of the Congress attending the present meeting had participated in the work of the Commission in this way and were thus thoroughly conversant with the issues involved.

The Section on Nomenclature of the present Congress had received notice from a considerable number of members of the Congress of their intention to present communications on a variety of interesting aspects of zoological nomenclature. He (the President) proposed that each meeting of the Section should be devoted partly to the consideration of reports from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the progress of its work and partly to receiving from members of the Congress the communications of which notice had been given. The Commission were anxious to work in the closest relations with the Section and to this end it was proposed that meetings of the Section should be held concurrently with meetings of the Commission. As President of the Section, he intended to permit a wide latitude of discussion at the meetings of the Section, but if disagreement were to arise on any particular question calling for action, it would be necessary to reserve the position of the Commission in order to prevent the recurrence of events such as those which had marred the

harmony of the proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature at Padua in 1930. There was every reason, however, to expect that this reservation would be of a purely formal character, for the discussions at the public meetings of the Commission encouraged the hope that the Section, like the Commission, would approach its task in a constructive spirit and with a desire to secure practical results through mutual understanding and common effort.

Continuing, the President said that, if it were found, as the result of discussion, that there was a likelihood that the Commission, given the opportunity, would be able to return an immediate answer on some of the questions raised in the communications which were to be made to the Section by individual members of the Congress, it was his intention to propose a brief adjournment of the meeting of the Section in order to permit of the necessary discussions between the members of the Commission.

Discussions at meetings of the Section would be either in French or English, the official languages respectively of the Congress and the Commission.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the statement by the President regarding the procedure to be adopted during the present Session of the Section.

Emendation of *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827, to *Psolos* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera)

2. M. H. BERTHET (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled " Un point de nomenclature. Doit-on dire ' *Psodos* ' et non ' *Psolos* ' Tr. ? (Lep. Geometridae) "[1]. M. Berthet explained that this communication, which had been published by him before the outbreak of the recent war (1938, *Bull. Soc. ent. France*, **43** : 151–152), was concerned with the orthography of the generic name which, when published by Treitschke (1827, *in* Ochsenheimer, *Schmett. Europa*, 6 (1) : 254), was spelt *Psodos*. Treitschke had added at the end of his description of this genus that this name was derived from the Greek word Πσόδος which, like the word σποδιος, had the meaning ash-coloured. It should be noted that the use for the first of these words of the initial letters pi and sigma, instead of the letter Psi, was a horrible barbarism which could only be due to a slip of the pen, a printers' error or to an error of transcription. Treitschke stated in his definition of this genus that the ground colour of the species which he referred to it was black. There was no such Greek word as that cited by Treitschke, but there was a very similar word, namely ψολος, which had the meaning " smoke " or " soot ", a meaning which was entirely consistent both with Treitschke's diagnosis and with the appearance of the alpine species

[1] For the text of M. Berthet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 157.

concerned, which were very well figured in Volume 4 of Culot's " Noctuelles et Géomètres d'Europe ". The name, as published by Treitschke, differed from *Psolos* only by the last letter but two, which in the Greek alphabet was the letter delta instead of the letter lamda. He (M. Berthet) had no doubt that the substitution of the letter " d " for the letter " l " in the transliteration of this word was due to an error. Such an error could easily occur in view of the great similarity of the two Greek letters, especially when these were written in capitals. He accordingly considered that the present was a case to which Article 19 of the *Règles* applied and was of the opinion that the spelling of this generic name should be emended from *Psodos* to *Psolos*.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the question of the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* raised questions of difficulty, everything depending in any given case on whether a " faute d'orthographe ", a " faute de transcription " or a " faute d'impression " was or was not " évident ". The whole of the group of problems raised by this Article required, in the opinion of the International Commission, very careful examination with a view to the substitution in the *Règles* of a more readily workable provision for that embodied in the present Article. The present case was much simpler than many which arose under this Article owing to the fact that the author of the generic name in question had attempted to indicate the origin of the word selected by specifying the Greek word from which it was derived. The issues involved had been stated by M. Berthet and it might be possible for the Commission to come to an immediate decision in view of the close similarity between the present case and that dealt with by the Commission in their *Opinion* 36 (1911, *Smithson. misc. Coll.*, 2013 : 84). In that case the Commission had had to consider whether three names (*Trioxocera*, *Dioxocera*, *Pentoxocera*) should be emended by the substitution of one letter for another (the letter " z " for the letter " x ") in the light of a partially incorrect statement by the original author of these names regarding their derivation from the Greek. He accordingly proposed that the meeting of the Section should be adjourned for a short time to enable the members of the Commission to consider the case submitted by M. Berthet.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider this case.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the case submitted by M. Berthet had been considered by the Commission which was unanimously of

the opinion that the case for the emendation of the name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827, to *Psolos* under the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles* had been established. A formal *Opinion* to this effect would be rendered by the Commission in due course and at the same time this generic name would be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology". The Section were indebted to M. Berthet for having brought forward this interesting case.

Stability in nomenclature versus rigid priority: Proposed extension and incorporation in the "Règles" of the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) had given notice of his wish to submit on behalf of a large number of Scandinavian zoologists two proposals, each having as its object the promotion of stability in nomenclature at the expense of rigid priority. The first of these proposals was concerned to secure an extension of the plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where the Commission considered that the strict application of those *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity. The second proposal aimed at the recognition in the *Règles* of a Law of Prescription which would safeguard from change names in current use from being upset under the Law of Priority by names published before 1850 but not used in scientific literature since that date. Although these proposals were closely inter-related, it would, in his (the President's) view, be convenient for the Section to discuss each separately, though naturally it would be open to the Section, if it so desired, to consider the two proposals in relation to one another after it had considered each in isolation. He added that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a proposal very similar to the second of Dr. Lemche's proposals. He invited Dr. Lemche to place the first of his proposals before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the proposal which he now brought forward was submitted on behalf of a large and representative group of Scandinavian zoologists actively engaged in systematic or economic work, largely in the field of entomology[2]. He had furnished the text of his proposal to the President of the Section in advance of the meeting of the Congress, and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his personal use. This proposal was designed to extend the plenary powers now possessed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature both by speeding up and by simplifying the procedure prescribed by the Congress in 1913. The changes proposed were: (1) the period of notice required to be given by the Commission before taking action on an application for the use of the

[2] For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 158—159.

plenary powers to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months ; (2) the deletion of the existing provision under which the Commission were bound to give the prescribed notice in two or more of five specified journals, none of which were commonly consulted by systematic zoologists and the substitution for this provision of one requiring the publication of notices in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and granting the Commission discretion to select other appropriate journals in which to publish these notices, these journals naturally varying according to the subject matter of the individual application concerned ; (3) the repeal of the provision requiring absolute unanimity in the Commission as a condition for the acceptance by the Commission of a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* under the plenary powers, and the substitution for the existing *Liberum Veto* of a provision authorising the Commission to use its plenary powers in any case where there was a two-thirds majority in the Commission in favour of so doing ; (4) the repeal of the existing provision under which, when two-thirds or more but not all of the Commissioners voting were in favour of the suspension of the *Règles*, the case was referred to the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress who thereupon appointed a special Board of Three Members, whose decision, either unanimous or by a majority, was final, and the substitution for this provision of one under which, when the voting on a proposal for the suspension of the *Règles* shows neither a two-thirds majority in favour nor a majority of two-thirds against suspension of the *Règles*, the case should be referred to the Section on Nomenclature, which, after discussion, would be free to authorise the Commission to re-examine the case and reach a decision thereon by a simple majority ; (5) the insertion of a provision placing on an equal footing every type of application where it could be shown that confusion rather than uniformity is likely to result from the strict application of the *Règles*, the special case of applications relating to the transfer of a name from one species to another being dealt with in future under the procedure suggested in (7) below ; (6) the insertion of an express direction to the Commission to reach decisions on applications for the suspension of the *Règles* as rapidly as is consistent with a proper study of the issues involved in each case ; (7) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging that, in cases involving the transfer of a name from one species to another, the problem should be brought to the attention of the Commission as soon as possible after it was discovered that a strict application of the *Règles* would lead to a transfer of this kind and that, pending a decision by the Commission on that application, the customary name should be retained for the species

concerned, in preference to the name which should strictly be used under the *Règles*.

Continuing, DR. LEMCHE said that he hoped that the Section on Nomenclature and also the Commission would give the most serious and sympathetic consideration to the proposal which he had just outlined. It was a very moderate proposal and, in the view of the zoologists by whom it was submitted, represented the minimum change necessary to meet the present situation. The Scandinavian zoologists who put forward this proposal were deeply concerned at what appeared to be the unduly strict way in which the Law of Priority was too often followed. This concern was heightened by the conviction that, in spite of its efforts, the Commission was unable to deal satisfactorily with this class of case under the limited powers at present conferred upon it.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as those of the members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, the problem raised by Dr. Lemche's proposal had received the most detailed consideration by the Commission during the last few days. The Commission agreed that the present situation was unsatisfactory from a number of points of view and that it was essential that during the present Congress adequate remedies should be devised. In the choice of the remedies to be recommended, the Commission felt bound, however, to give due weight to the views of all types of zoologist. He asked the Section to believe that, if the recommendations submitted by the Commission appeared timid and lacking in vision, this was due not to any faint-heartedness on the part of the Commission or to any failure to recognise the profound dissatisfaction felt by many zoologists at the numerous changes in scientific names which were still taking place as the result of a strict application of the Law of Priority. The Commission was, however, the trustee for all zoologists and it was its duty therefore to steer a middle course in this matter between, on the one hand, the views held by those zoologists who believed that an adequate degree of stability in nomenclature could be secured only by placing some limitation upon the Law of Priority and on the other hand the views of those zoologists who regarded the Law of Priority as the sheet anchor of zoological nomenclature and were opposed therefore to any curtailment in the vigour of that Law. In pursuing this policy the Commission would, no doubt, be criticised by the hotheads in either camp, but, in view of the importance of securing the maximum degree of agreement regarding the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles*, the policy of the

Commission in this matter was, he was convinced, the one most likely to serve the common interest.

The proposals which he (the President) had now to lay before the Section on behalf of the Commission were general in character, being concerned not only with the special problem of the scope of the plenary powers entrusted to the Commission by the Congress but also with the reform of the procedure of the Commission in relation to applications of other kinds and with the reform of the Commission as a body. As the Section would see, the Commission looked upon this entire group of proposals as forming a single closely-integrated plan of reform. The adoption of the plan now submitted would, the Commission believed, secure for it a higher degree of efficiency and, in particular, a much greater speed in operation than that ever previously achieved. In approaching this problem the Commission had been inspired by a desire both to make the Commission as a body more genuinely representative and more genuinely international in character and also to secure the maximum degree of reform in the procedure of the Commission that could be achieved. The proposals now submitted followed the general lines set out in Commission Papers **I.C.(48)3** and **4,** copies of which had already been distributed. Additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use.

On the question of the composition of the Commission as a body, the Commission felt that, having regard to the heavy responsibilities with which the Commission was charged, every possible measure should be taken to broaden the basis of the membership of the Commission and thereby to enhance its authority. The Commission accordingly proposed that the existing upper limit of the membership of the Commission should be abolished, but a lower limit of 18 retained. Under this system it would be possible for zoologists of any country in which any considerable volume of zoological work was being carried on to secure direct representation upon the Commission, if they so desired. As regards the mode of electing members of the Commission, it was proposed that nominations should be made by or through the leading scientific bodies in the countries concerned ; the election would be made either by the Congress (in Congress years) or by the Commission itself (acting through its Executive Committee) at other times. In this respect the procedure would follow existing practice. It would be the duty of the Executive Committee to secure a proper balance in the membership of the Commission both of different types of knowledge in systematic and applied zoology and also of geographical representation. As at

present, one-third of the total membership of the Commission would retire automatically at each meeting of the Congress. This system would, by its flexibility, secure both a high degree of direct representation of the zoologists of the various countries and also an adequate degree of control by the Congress over the membership of the Commission. In addition, it was proposed that the Commission should be free to summon to its membership specialists of outstanding distinction in a particular field, irrespective of their nationality. From the indications already received by the Commission both before and since the opening of the present Congress, it was evident that the reforms described above were assured of a wide welcome from zoologists in many countries which, through the limitation hitherto imposed on the membership of the Commission, had till now been excluded from representation.

The Commission hoped also that the Congress would take the present opportunity to institute certain minor reforms in the regulations governing the membership of the Commission. It was desirable (1) that the Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the Commission, should be empowered to grant leave of absence to a member of the Commission in certain circumstances and to appoint an Alternate Member to act in his place, an Alternate Member so appointed to have full voting rights in exactly the same way as Alternate Members appointed by the Commission to take the place, during meetings held at the Congress, of members of the Commission who were unable to be present; (2) that Commissioners who failed to vote on proposed *Opinions* or *Declarations* on five successive occasions should be liable to be removed; (3) that, on incurring any of certain specified disabilities (imprisonment, bankruptcy, insanity), a member of the Commission should vacate his position as such; (4) that a member of the Commission should be free to resign his membership on giving notice in writing.

Turning to the question of the procedure of the Commission, which was dealt with in detail in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)4,** the President said that the members of the Commission were very conscious of the fact that, as a body, the Commission was open to criticism on the ground of the long period commonly required to obtain decisions on applications submitted to it. In part, these long delays were due to the inevitable difficulties which confronted any organisation which met only at long intervals and had therefore to conduct most of its business by correspondence. To a considerable extent, however, the slow-moving character of the Commission was due to faulty and inadequate machinery. In some respects the remedy lay

in the hands of the Commission itself, but in others the Commission needed the assistance of the Section on Nomenclature and the Congress before suitable remedies could be found. Under the first of these heads, the most serious stumbling-block to efficiency was the *Liberum Veto* gratuitously imposed by the Commission on itself in 1910, so far as concerned proposals affecting the reform of the *Règles*. At the present Session the Commission had agreed to annul the vote taken by themselves on this subject nearly 40 years ago and had adopted a much more business-like system, under which in future any proposal for the amendment or alteration of the *Règles* could, after the expiry of a period of six months from the date on which it was submitted by the Secretary to all the members of the Commission, be adopted as the recommendation of the whole Commission and would be incorporated in a *Declaration* for submission to the next meeting of the Congress, if at least one fourth of the members of the Commission had recorded their votes, and at least two out of every three votes cast were affirmative votes, votes cast by Commissioners who signified their willingness to support whatever view was held by the majority of the Commission being calculated as affirmative votes. In all other cases, except cases involving the use by the Commission of its plenary powers, the procedure would be similar, except that a proposed decision would be adopted as the decision of the whole Commission and incorporated in an *Opinion* if the number of affirmative votes exceeded the number of negative votes, if any. By these and other means the Commission hoped to be able to secure that, as soon as the present arrears of work had been cleared off, it would normally be possible for them to reach a decision on an application within 18 months of its receipt. The Commission proposed to publish an announcement on this subject for the information of the zoological public. It would readily be recognised how great would be the importance of this reform if it could be achieved, in view of the fact that in the past it had commonly taken from 5 to 10 years to obtain a decision from the Commission and not infrequently much longer.

Every effort would be made to live up to this programme but it must be realised that the whole position of the Commission must remain precarious, so long as the despatch of its day-to-day work depended upon the amount of time—either at night or at week-ends—which could be given to it by a spare-time honorary Secretary, who had to earn his living during the day in some other occupation. A substantial grant had been received by the Commission from U.N.E.S.C.O. to defray the cost of technical assis-

tance and office expenses, but, valuable as that was, it provided no solution to the central problem, namely how to secure that a sufficient number of hours of work should be devoted regularly to the direction of the affairs of the Commission. The situation would never be satisfactory until the Commission possessed an income sufficiently large and secure to enable it to employ a highly qualified whole-time salaried official responsible for discharging the bulk of the duties which at present had to be performed by the honorary Secretary.

There remained the special problem of the procedure to be followed by the Commission in dealing with applica tions for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in particular cases. This was the problem to which the proposal submitted by Dr. Lemche and his colleagues was specially directed. As Dr. Lemche and those members of the Section who had attended the recent meetings of the Commission were aware, this subject had received most careful consideration at the hands of the Commission who had had before them both Dr. Lemche's proposals and also certain less far-reaching proposals submitted by the Secretary. As a result, the Commission had reached conclusions which, though they did not go so far as Dr. Lemche and his colleagues had suggested, nevertheless went some distance in that direction. These conclusions had been reached unanimously by the Commission and had had the full support also of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meeting of the Commission. He (the President) hoped therefore that these conclusions would meet also with the full approval and support of the Section on Nomenclature.

The proposals in regard to the modification of the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution of March, 1913 (the text of which was embodied in the Commission's *Declaration* 5), which he now laid before the Section were as follows :—(1) the period of notice to be reduced from 12 months to 6 months ; (2) the grant to the Commission of discretion to choose the most appropriate journal in which to give notice of proposals involving the use of the plenary powers, subject to the condition that in every case such notice should be given by the Commission in its own journal, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, and that, of the other journals in which notice should be given, at least one should be a journal published in Europe and one a journal published in America ; (3) the obsolete and objectionable *Liberum Veto* to be abolished and in its place a rule adopted under which a proposal for the use of the plenary powers would require a two-thirds majority of the

votes cast in the same way as proposals affecting the text of the *Règles* ; (4) consequent upon this change, provisos (*b*) and (*c*) to Article 1 of the Resolution of March, 1913, to be repealed, together with Article 2 of that Resolution (which related to the setting-up of Boards of Three Members to consider cases where the Commission was not unanimously in favour of the use of the plenary powers in any given case but two-thirds of the members of the Commission favoured that course), other than the portion relating to the final character of decisions taken by the Commission under the plenary powers. Finally, the Commission recommended that the provisions relating to the use of the plenary powers should be incorporated in the *Règles* as a substantive Article, for those provisions formed as much a part of the international law relating to zoological nomenclature as any of the provisions already included in the *Règles*.

THE PRESIDENT added that the Commission looked upon their proposals for the reform of the membership of the Commission and the proposals for the reform of its procedure as intimately connected with one another. The Commission considered that these proposals constituted a balanced programme, each part of which was as necessary as any other. The Commission asked that the Section should regard these proposals in this light. Finally, the Commission asked also that the proposed reforms in procedure should enter into force forthwith.

The Commission proposed that, if the Congress approved their proposals for the reform of the rules governing the composition and procedure of the Commission, the Commission's By-Laws should be thoroughly revised, both to make them complete and also to distinguish between the organic provisions prescribed by the Congress (and therefore capable of being altered only by the Congress) and the remaining provisions, not being inconsistent with the organic provisions, which had been adopted by the Commission itself and which could be altered by that body.

DR. LEMCHE said that, while the proposals submitted by the Commission for the reform of the plenary powers procedure did not go so far as he and his colleagues had advocated, he recognised that the reformed procedure now proposed was a great improvement on that laid down in 1913. He had taken part in the discussions in the Commission which had led up to the presetn proposals and he was prepared to accept them on behalf both of himself and of the Scandinavian zoologists for whom he was acting.

After other members of the Sectino had signified their concurrence in the proposals put forward by the Commission, MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM

submitted a motion that the proposals in regard to the reform of the rules governing the membership and procedure of the Commission which had been laid before the Section by the President on behalf of the Commission be approved and adopted and that the Section should submit a recommendation to the International Congress of Zoology that they should approve those proposals at the final *Concilium Plenum* of the present meeting of the Congress. The motion proposed by MR. RILEY was thereupon seconded by PROFESSOR E. BELTRÁN (MEXICO). After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire to move an amendment to this proposal and no such amendment having been brought forward, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) added that a reference to this subject would be included in the Report which would in due course be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval and transmission to the Congress for presentation at the final *Concilium Plenum.*

Proposed incorporation in the "Règles" of a provision establishing a Law of Prescription limiting the scope of the Law of Priority

4. THE SECTION turned next to consider the second of the two proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in the interest of securing greater stability in nomenclature of which notice had been received from Dr. Lemche[3].

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that the object of the proposal which he now laid before the Section was to prevent the upsetting, on grounds of priority, of well-established names which had been in common use for upwards of a century. The Law of Priority was of great value, in so far as it served the purpose for which it had originally been adopted, namely, the promotion of uniformity in nomenclature, but it was a defect of that Law that it could be employed to upset well-known names by substituting for them long-forgotten names of earlier date dug up for the purpose from obscure books or journals which had long since passed into oblivion. It was to remedy this defect of the Law of Priority that he and his colleagues in the Scandinavian countries proposed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* which would afford protection to names which had been in general use since the beginning of the year 1850. They accordingly proposed the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision in the following terms: "A name of a genus or species, given before the year 1850 and not used in scientific literature since 1st January 1850, is to be rejected in favour

[3] For the text of Dr. Lemche's communication, see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 159—161.

of such other name which has been in general use for the genus or species in question since that date."

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was thoroughly in agreement with the object of the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche. Although himself a professional museum worker, he had no sympathy with those who spent their time in unearthing old names and substituting them for well-known names in current use. It was much to be regretted that time should be wasted in unfruitful work of this kind, which contributed nothing to the knowledge of systematics, when there were so many urgent and important problems awaiting study. Personally, he would like to see also a great development of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the grant of absolute protection against the Law of Priority to names once placed upon that List. He would like, for example, to see the generic nomenclature of the Class Mammalia stabilised by the grant of official approval to the names used in the admirable list published by Dr. G. G. Simpson, of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. If action of this kind could not be taken under the *Règles* as they stood, then let the *Règles* be changed as soon as possible to enable this to be done. Zoologists were tired of endless disputes on questions of priority. What they wanted was stability of nomenclature so that they could get on with their proper work. He urged both the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Congress not to allow themselves to be too timid in this matter. They should keep abreast of the current sentiment of zoologists and, in deference to that sentiment, adopt a statesmanlike and progressive view in this matter.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he was strongly opposed to the digging-up of old names and the unearthing of old books containing forgotten names, and the substitution of those names for well-known names in common use. He suggested that the Section should invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the best means to be adopted for banning the upsetting of well-established names in this way, and to submit a report on this subject to the next meeting of the Congress. If this course were to be agreed upon by the Section, Dr. Lemche would, he hoped, be prepared not to press for an immediate decision on the proposal which he had himself laid before the Section.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) said that, if the Section so preferred, he would be prepared to fall in with the alternative course suggested by Mr. Riley, and in that event he would himself second Mr. Riley's proposal. What

he and his colleagues were anxious to secure was that an end should be put to the use of the Law of Priority as an instrument for upsetting current nomenclature. Any well-founded proposal to this end would receive the support of his colleagues and himself.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that he was in thorough agreement with the views which had been expressed. He considered it important that an effective settlement should be reached. If this could not be achieved during the present Congress, he would not offer objection to the proposal made by Mr. Riley, provided that it was made clear that the Congress regarded this question as a matter of urgency and that it was intended that the question should be brought to a definite issue at the next meeting of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the proposal brought forward by Dr. Lemche dealt with a matter of great importance and it was evident that a growing body of zoologists felt that the present provisions in the *Règles* were not sufficient to secure stability in nomenclature. Dr. Lemche's proposal, as also a similar proposal which had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France), had the same object as that which the Congress had set itself when at Monaco in 1913 they had granted the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in cases where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise occur. The present proposal went considerably further than the Congress had then thought it prudent to go, for it contemplated the automatic rejection of names published before a certain date, where those names had not been used in scientific literature subsequent thereto.

He agreed with the suggestion that this question should be referred to the International Commission for investigation, for the problems involved in working out practicable provisions which would secure the desired object without at the same time giving rise to anomalies were probably greater than appeared on the surface. If the survey to be undertaken by the Commission were to produce the best possible results, it should cover the whole field, and the terms of reference to be given to the Commission should be general in character. He suggested therefore that the Commission should be invited : " to consider generally the problem of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with proposals, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology." The Commission would thus be able to take

into account all relevant factors, including the whole problem of the adequacy of the plenary powers granted to the Commission and the principles which should govern the use of those powers. This subject, which clearly deserved consideration, had been raised in a document which just before the opening of the present Congress he had received from a group of specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, who, unlike the zoologists attending the present meeting, were in favour of a narrower rather than a wider use of those powers.

MR. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that, if no change was to be made in the mandatory portion of the *Règles* until the next meeting of the Congress five years hence, it was, he thought, important that the present Congress should at least indicate its view on the question raised by Dr. Lemche by adding a *Recommandation* to Article 25 of the *Règles* urging authors who discovered that a well-known name was invalid to refer the case at once to the Commission and to refrain from changing the name in question until a decision on the question had been reached by the Commission.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) agreed that, if a decision on the general issue was to be deferred until the next meeting of the Congress, it became all the more important that the limited action proposed by Mr. Delacour should be taken by the present Congress. He accordingly seconded Mr. Delacour's proposal.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he was in sympathy with the views expressed by Mr. Delacour and Mr. Morrison-Scott. The insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be in harmony with the general view of the International Commission that it was desirable that the *Règles* should indicate, by means of non-mandatory *Recommandations*, the ideal standard of procedure in cases where, without such guidance, some zoologists might follow courses which were at variance with the general will. A *Recommandation* of the kind proposed would be of still greater value if it were to draw special attention to the need for avoiding the upsetting, on technical grounds of priority, of names which were of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other applied fields of biology. Nothing had done more to bring zoological nomenclature into discredit with men of science who were not systematists than the failure of the *Règles* to prevent changes on narrow technical grounds of the names of animals of importance outside the field of systematic zoology.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that in the case of generic names it was not only priority which led to the discarding of well-known names, for rectifications in the designations of type species had exactly the same effect. He suggested therefore that words should be added to the proposed *Recommandation* to cover this point.

After further discussion the PRESIDENT said that the Section appeared to be unanimous as to the general line of action to be taken. He proposed therefore to ask the Section to adjourn for a short time to enable him to draw up a form of words giving effect to what appeared to be the general wish, so that the Section might have a concrete proposal on which to continue their discussion. As the action proposed included the addition of a new, though non-mandatory, provision to the *Règles*, it was his duty, as President of the Section, to ascertain the views of the Commission before he formally put the question to the Section. He would take advantage of the proposed adjournment to consult the members of the Commission on this question.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time to enable the President both to prepare for its consideration a form of words embodying the substance of the preceding discussion and also to consult the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the International Commission were unanimously in favour of the course advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines :—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree :—

(1) to take note (*a*) of the proposal put forward by Dr. H. Lemche (Denmark) for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prohibit the replacement, on grounds of priority, of well-known names by names published prior to 1850 where those names had not subsequently been used in scientific

literature and (*b*) of the similar proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France);

(2) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to study the question of how to secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology;

(3) to recommend that, without prejudice to the recommendations to be submitted under (2) above, there should at once be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision:

(a) that, where a worker discovers that a well-known name in common use, particularly a name of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields of biology, is invalid under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy or, in the case of a generic name, has as its type species a species other than the species commonly accepted as such, that worker should at once report the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as the Commission may deem to be proper;

(b) that in such a case neither the worker by whom the error in accepted practice is discovered nor any subsequent worker should change that practice by substituting some other name for that in common use until such time as the decision on the future status of the name in question is made known by the said Commission.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense. As the action now contemplated owed its inspiration to the initiative taken by Dr. Lemche and his Scandinavian colleagues, it would be particularly appropriate if he were to move the proposed resolution.

DR. HENNING LEMCHE (DENMARK) then proposed, and MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Nomenclature of Protozoan and other parasites of Man

5. PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) then presented his paper on " Les Protozoaires de l'Homme ". Professor Beltrán said that at the present time many of the Protozoa parasitic to Man were known by names possessing only a *de facto* basis.[4] If the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, many of those names would be found to be invalid and in need of replacement. The older literature was highly involved and the solution of the numerous and complicated taxonomic questions required the active co-operation of specialists. He therefore suggested the appointment of a committee of protozoologists charged with the duty of studying the nomenclature of Protozoa, with a view to the submission of recommendations to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the addition to the " Official List " of the names of genera, in those cases where it was found that the names in question were available under the *Règles* for use in the sense in which they were commonly employed, and, in the case of names not found to be so available, for validation by the Commission as a preliminary to their being also placed on the " Official List ".

Continuing, Professor Beltrán expressed the view that the greatest care should be taken by the International Commission, when rendering *Opinions*, to confine themselves strictly to nomenclatorial questions. Sufficient attention had not always been paid in the past to this important principle. For example, *Opinion* 99, which dealt with the relative status of the names *Endamoeba* Leidy, 1879, and *Entamoeba* Casagrandi & Barbagello, 1895, contained much matter of a taxonomic character which was totally out of place in a discussion on nomenclature. On the other hand, Professor Beltrán welcomed the policy adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 104, in which, when stabilising the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites, the Commission had made express provision both for those protozoologists who regarded the quartan and aestivo-autumnal parasites as congeneric and also for those who took the opposite taxonomic view. For the benefit of the former, the Commission had placed on the " Official List " the generic

[4] For the text of Professor Beltrán's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 162–163.

name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885, while for the benefit of the latter they had added also the name *Laverania* Grassi & Feletti, 1890. In this way the Commission had succeeded in stabilising the nomenclature of these important genera, without expressing any view on the taxonomic relationships of the species concerned.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission had adopted a resolution (subsequently embodied in *Declaration* 10) welcoming the formation of groups of specialists for the study of the nomenclature of particular groups of the Animal Kingdom. Professor Beltrán's proposal for the appointment of a committee of protozoologists to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa was assured, therefore, of the hearty support of the Commission. That there was a real need for such a committee was evident from the difficulties which had been encountered in regard to the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania*, to which Professor Beltrán had referred, for, although the entries in regard to these names made in the " Official List " were in complete harmony with the universal practice of protozoologists, investigations undertaken recently both by Professor Robert L. Usinger and Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky in the United States and by himself had shown that under the *Règles* those entries were incorrect in almost every particular. In that particular case proposals for validating existing practice would be laid before the Commission later during its present Session, and it was to be hoped therefore that the position as regards these names would shortly be regularised. It was naturally not possible for the Commission itself or for its Secretary to undertake such investigations except in special cases such as the present which had been necessitated by the need to correct the erroneous entries already inadvertently made in the " Official List ". In this field therefore the assistance of a committee of specialists such as had been suggested would be of particular value.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 6th meeting, Minute 8*).

Professor Beltrán had alluded to the need for the Commission to exclude taxonomic considerations when deciding whether to include generic names on the " Official List ". In making this observation, Professor Beltrán had raised a point the importance of which was not always sufficiently understood. The object of the " Official List " was to stabilise the use of the names of certain genera for their respective type species. The decision taken in such cases was purely nomenclatorial, though it inevitably carried with it the corollary that the names so stabilised, and no other names, should also be used for any species

which specialists might regard on taxonomic grounds as being congeneric with the type species of the genera concerned. It was no part, however, of the function of the Commission to decide, or for the " Official List " to imply, any view as to the taxonomic limits of genera. He, therefore, welcomed the approval expressed by Professor Beltrán of the action taken by the Commission when in *Opinion* 104 they had placed on the " Official List " not only the oldest generic name (*Plasmodium*) for any of the human malaria parasites but also the name *Laverania* for the benefit of those protozoologists who regarded the aestivo-autumnal parasite (which was the type of that genus) as referable to a different genus from that to which the quartan parasite was assigned. It would be very helpful to the Commission when considering proposals for further additions to the " Official List " if the Congress were now expressly to place on record their approval of the policy of placing two or more generic names on the " Official List " in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved.

MR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the appointment of the proposed committee had his support, for the object underlying that proposal was to secure that, if well-established nomenclatorial practice and the Law of Priority were to come into conflict with one another, it should be the Law of Priority and not well-established nomenclatorial practice which should go to the wall.

The view was expressed in subsequent discussion that, while it was certainly important to stabilise the names of genera in the Phylum Protozoa containing species which were parasitic to Man, it was equally important to stabilise the names of genera in other Phyla containing such species. It was accordingly suggested that the proposal before the Section should be modified to take account of this consideration. It was realised that the literature involved might be so specialised that it might be found desirable either to divide the proposed committee into panels, each of which would concentrate upon the nomenclature of parasites belonging to a particular Phylum, or to appoint separate committees to undertake such studies.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that his object in bringing forward the proposal which he had laid before the Section was to secure that a start should

be made in the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the parasites of Man. In that proposal he had specified the Phylum Protozoa, for that was the group in which he was specially interested, but he agreed that it would be of advantage to consider the nomenclature of all parasites of Man, irrespective of the Phyla to which they belonged. He accordingly supported the extension of his proposal which had been suggested.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) asked the Section to adjourn for a short time both to permit the members of the Commission to confer together and to enable him to draft a form of words to give effect to the general sense of the discussion.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn for a short time for the purposes indicated by the President.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the members of the Commission were unanimously in favour of the course which had been advocated in the discussion which had taken place in the Section immediately prior to the adjournment. He suggested that effect would be given to that discussion if the Section were now to adopt a resolution on the following lines :—

Proposed Resolution

THE SECTION agree :—

(1) to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to concert with specialists for the appointment of a committee or committees to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa and other Phyla containing species parasitic to Man and to make proposals to the Commission for the addition to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", whether under the plenary powers or otherwise, of the names of leading genera in those Phyla, particularly genera containing species parasitic to Man, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the species concerned ;

(2) to place on record, for the guidance of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, their view that, in order to eliminate taxonomic problems from consideration when names are added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", it is desirable that two or more generic names should be placed on that List, in cases where specialists are agreed on the importance

of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but are not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus is involved.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) then proposed, and Mr. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the "Règles"

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered was the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (binary nomenclature) as used in the *Règles*. The Section would recall that the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 had charged the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to examine, and to submit to the present Congress a Report on, the meaning of the foregoing expression as used in the *Règles*. This action had been taken in the hope that an objective study of this subject, undertaken in consultation with leading specialists, would provide a means for bringing to an end the deplorable controversy which for so long had centred round this subject and which had come to a head in 1930 as the result of hasty and ill-considered action taken in the Section on Nomenclature at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology. In the interval which had elapsed since the Lisbon Congress, this problem had been the subject of extensive discussions carried out on behalf of the Commission by their Secretary by correspondence with leading specialists in different parts of the world on the basis of a paper published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in which he had set out the issues involved and by extensive personal discussions at meetings held both in America and in Europe. It was extremely gratifying to find that, as the result of these discussions, the ground had

been cleared for a solution of this problem on terms which would be mutually acceptable to zoologists of all shades of opinion. A draft Report had been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the basis of these discussions. Copies of this document had been distributed under cover of Commission Paper **I.C.(48)5** and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use. The Commission had unanimously approved and adopted this Report and had authorised and requested the Secretary to sign it on their behalf and submit it to the President of the Section in discharge of the duty committed to the Commission by the Lisbon Congress.

The Commission pointed out in this Report that two distinct questions were involved : (1) What was the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as actually used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles* ? (2) Is that meaning the meaning which it is the general wish of zoologists should be conveyed by those Articles, and, if not, what change in the wording of those Articles is desirable ? The examination carried out into the first of these questions had shown conclusively that, as used in the two Articles of the *Règles* concerned, the expression " nomenclature binaire " bore a meaning identical with that which would have been conveyed if, instead of that expression, the expression " nomenclature binominale " had been employed. As regards the second of the two questions involved, it was evident from the consultations which had been held that the foregoing meaning was also the meaning which the general body of zoologists desired should be conveyed by Articles 25 and 26, provided that suitable safeguards were introduced to protect certain generic names in common use which had been published subsequent to 1757 by authors who, while accepting the proposition that the name of a species should convey two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species, did not give effect to that proposition by using the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature. Accordingly, in the Report now submitted, the Commission recommended that both in Article 25 and in Article 26 the expression " nomenclature binominale " should be substituted for the expression " nomenclature binaire " and that the plenary powers should be used to protect the special class of generic names to which reference had just been made. It was further agreed that there should be attached to the *Règles* a schedule, to be known as the First Schedule (in contrast to the existing *Appendice*, which it was proposed should in future be known as the " Second Schedule "), in which should be inserted particulars of every decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers. A record

would therefore be found in this Schedule of every decision taken by the Commission to validate generic names published by non-binominal authors or to validate books containing such names. Further, the Commission proposed that the Article which (earlier in the present meeting) the Section had agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* to incorporate the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, subject to certain amendments agreed upon by the Section, should contain a provision exempting applications for the validation of generic names or of books of the kind specified above from the regulations prescribing the giving of specified notice required in other cases involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. In one case of outstanding importance to ornithologists, namely, the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his " Ornithologia ", the Commission had agreed to take action at once by placing that book in the proposed First Schedule to the *Règles*, thereby securing the immediate availability of the names in question. Consequential upon the foregoing conclusions, the Commission had agreed to cancel *Opinion* 20 (which contained an incorrect interpretation of the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire ") and *Opinion* 37 (which stated—incorrectly—that under the existing *Règles* the generic names in Brisson's " Ornithologia " were nomenclatorially available) and to modify (in a manner which the President then explained) the wording of the " summary " of *Opinion* 24 and the title of *Opinion* 35.

In submitting the present Report to the Section and, through the Section, to the Congress, the Commission were happy to record that they had been able to achieve the unanimous settlement of a problem which had baffled every previous attempt to secure general agreement.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the Commission was to be congratulated on the way in which they had discharged the duty imposed upon them by the Lisbon Congress. The task had been one of great difficulty, and the successful outcome of the labours of the Commission would, he felt sure, be warmly welcomed by the Section. He had pleasure in proposing the adoption of the Report of the Commission and its submission to the Congress.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that he wished to associate himself with the tribute just paid to the work of the Commission in this matter. He seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Riley.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then enquired whether any other member wished to comment on the Report and in particular whether any member

wished to move an amendment to the motion which had just been proposed. No such amendment was, however, proposed. THE PRESIDENT then put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : date and time appointed

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he did not propose to lay any further business before the Section at its present meeting. Good progress had been made by the Section in the important task before them, and there was every reason to hope that before the end of the Congress the Section would have completed the whole of their programme. The next meeting of the Section would be held at the same place on the morning of the following day, Saturday, 24th July, at 09.00 hours.

(*The Section thereupon adjourned at* 12.05 *hours*)

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Second Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the Tenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France) (*Secretary-General to the Congress*)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level

1. PROFESSOR R. JEANNEL (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Sur la nomenclature des groupements supergénériques"[5]. After pointing out that zoologists were agreed that the authors of systems of classification were free to coin words to denote the great systematic categories from the Class downwards as far as the Sub-Order, Professor Jeannel observed that the position was quite different in the case of the names of families, sub-families and tribes. For these categories the *Règles* provided that the Law of Priority applied to the earliest proposed of the supergeneric units, provided that the name was formed from the stem of the name of a genus contained in the group and that the generic name in question was itself an available name and that there was added to the stem a particular Latin termination. The terminations in question were "-idae" for the names of families, "-inae" for the names of sub-families, "-ini" for the names of tribes. Professor Jeannel then raised two questions in regard to the nomenclature of this class of category.

Under the first of these heads, Professor Jeannel observed that it was absurd to use the termination "-inae" to denote a sub-family and the termination "-ini" to denote a tribe, for the first of these words was no more than the feminine of the second. The present method of denoting sub-families by the use of a feminine termination led to barbarisms resulting from the fact that it was customary in everyday speech to treat them as though they were of the masculine gender. He suggested, therefore, that a new termination should be adopted to denote the category of sub-family and that that termination should be such that the word so formed would be of the masculine gender. He accordingly proposed the adoption of the termination "-itae".

Passing to the second of the questions which he wished to raise, Professor Jeannel said that it was not possible to formulate for the selection of the names of families, sub-families and tribes rigid rules strictly based upon priority. It was, in his view, necessary to take account of two factors: (1) priority; (2) legitimity. The first of these principles was recognised in the existing provisions of the *Règles*—to which he had already referred. He could not accept the proposition advanced by Bradley in 1928 that, as a condition precedent to the acceptance of a name proposed for one of these categories, that name must have been published in the form of a Latin plural, for such a stipulation would rule out most unfairly the work of the great masters of the early XIXth century, to whom entomologists owed the foundations of the systematics of insects. When

[5] For the text of Professor Jeannel's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 164–165.

he had referred to the principle of legitimity he had had in mind such cases as those where a tribe was established for the reception of some aberrant genus (as Schaum in 1870 had established the tribe *Mormolycini* for the species *Mormolyce phylloides*), and it was later found that the species so separated should in fact be referred to a well-defined family of later date (as, in the example cited above, had happened when it was found by Chaudoir that the genus *Mormolyce* should be referred to the family containing the Thyreopterids. In such a case it would be an illegitimate use of priority to apply the name *Mormolycidae* (based upon the tribe name *Mormolycini* originally proposed by Schaum) to the whole family as defined later by Chaudoir. A provision should, he suggested, be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with this class of case. He agreed that any provision recognising the principle of legitimity would inevitably contain a subjective element. He considered, however, that this was a case where a certain discretion should be allowed to the authors of monographs. After a time the customary usage so established would acquire the force of law.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the paper presented by Professor Jeannel was very opportune, for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had decided at a meeting held the previous day that the existing provisions (Articles 4 and 5) in the *Règles* in regard to the names of families and sub-families were totally inadequate and that the position in this part of the field of nomenclature would not be satisfactory until a comprehensive and logical plan covering all aspects of the problem had been worked out and embodied in the *Règles*. The Commission had accordingly invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a thorough study of this problem, in consultation with interested specialists, and to submit a report thereon for their consideration at the meeting to be held during the next (Fourteenth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology. The paper just communicated by Professor Jeannel would form a valuable part of the dossier in this case. He thanked Professor Jeannel for the interesting and valuable contribution which he had made to this subject.

Nomenclature of Families and Sub-families

2. PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) referred to the paper by Professor E. G. Linsley and himself entitled " The use of new names for preoccupied names in zoological nomenclature ", of his wish to present which to the Section he had given notice prior to the opening of the present Congress. In that paper he and Professor Linsley

had raised a number of questions relating to the formation of the names of families and sub-families. As an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, he had since taken part in the decision to invite the Secretary to the Commission to carry out the study to which the President had just referred. In the circumstances, he considered that it would be sufficient if the communication by Professor Linsley and himself were embodied in the material to be studied in connection with the proposed review of the problem of family names, and he had handed a copy of their paper to the Secretary to the Commission for this purpose. He did not therefore now desire to communicate the paper to the Section.

Proposed recognition of the concepts "grade" and "pseudo-genus"

3. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Les notions de grade et de pseudo-genre."[6] M. Deflandre said that in a recent paper (1941) on the concept of genus as applied to the Silico-flagellids, he had adopted, when dealing with *Naviculopsis* Frenguelli, the expression "grade" in the sense in which that expression had been used by Cuénot (1936) when he wrote: "le pseudo-genre étant polygénétique doit donc être consideré non comme un genre, mais comme un 'grade' (mot de Bather, 1927)". In fact, however, the meaning attached to this expression by Cuénot was not identical with that adopted by Bather. Cuénot had given the following definition: "*Grade* (Bather, 1927). Certaine forme d'organisation qui peut apparaître séparément dans plusieurs lignées parallèles; c'est un pseudo-genre." Bather had referred to grades as "evolutionary stages, separated by horizontal lines indicating time-limits and denoted by an epithet or phrase not interfering with the systematic hierarchy". Later in the same paper Bather had observed that "more genera represent grades of organisation rather than lines of descent". In his (M. Deflandre's) view, it was desirable that the expression "grade" should be restricted to the meaning originally bestowed upon it by Bather. Nevertheless, the definition given by Cuénot corresponded to a precise conception, which was applicable to a number of cases. The concept defined by Cuénot should be rendered concrete by the adoption for it of a special term. Rather than coin a new name for this purpose he (M. Deflandre) proposed that there should be given to the expression "pseudo-genus" (pseudo-genre) a restricted sense corresponding to the definition given by Cuénot.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVAN (FRANCE) said that he thought that many of the apparent "polyphyletic genera" would

[6] For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 166.

sooner or later be recognised as consisting of a number of true monophyletic genera, to which the ordinary system of nomenclature could be applied. For this reason he thought it would be preferable to wait until our knowledge was sufficiently advanced to subdivide the " pseudo-genera " into their constituent monophyletic parts, to which the normal nomenclature could be applied, rather than to apply a special nomenclature to the " pseudo-genera ". In any case the problem called for the most careful consideration, and if it were ultimately found necessary to introduce the concept of a " pseudo-genus " it would be desirable that the Commission should give a precise ruling as to its significance.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) thanked M. Deflandre for the interesting communication which he had just made to the Section. It appeared to him, as he had listened to it, that the subject matter was concerned with technical terminology rather than with nomenclature. The two subjects were, however, closely related to one another and it was important that workers concerned with both subjects should keep in close touch with one another. M. Deflandre's communication would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for consideration, though, for the reasons which he had explained, it seemed unlikely that the Commission would be able to take any positive action.

Nomenclature of fossil fragments of the kind known as organites or sclerites in invertebrates

4. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE then presented, on his behalf and that of Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud, a communication entitled " La nomenclature des fragments fossiles (organites et sclérites) d'Invertébrés[7]". M. Deflandre said that the tendency in applied micropalaeontology to make use of every vestige of organic life found in the sedimentary rocks gave rise to a general problem of nomenclature to which Croneis had proposed a solution. The bestowal of names upon fossil fragments of invertebrates of the kind known as organites or sclerites presented a special problem, for, although such a fragment was sufficient sometimes to characterise a species, more often such a determination was either doubtful or impossible. For practical reasons and because of their use in stratigraphy, it was necessary to designate such fragments by Latin binominal names formed in accordance with the Linnean system. In order, however, to meet the objections to this course expressed by certain biologists and to ward against the risk of erroneous interpretations, for example, attribution to a genus of unknown age, owing to the use of the particular generic name concerned for a microfossil,

[7] For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre and Mme. Deflandre-Rigaud, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 167.

it seemed desirable to ban the use for such fragments of the terms "genus" and "species" and of the names of genera already established. To deal with this problem, Croneis had proposed that the existing terms employed in biological nomenclature should be replaced for fossil fragments of the kind under discussion by a system of nomenclature based upon the *ordo militaris* of Ancient Rome. Thus, the hierarchy Class-Order-Family-Genus-Species would for the present purpose be replaced by the hierarchy Exercitus-Legio-Cohors-Manipulus-Centuria. Under this system, names belonging to these categories would, on being first published, be followed by *cohors nov.*, *manip. nov.*, *cent. nov.*, etc. It would be desirable that, where a Manipulus appeared to be related morphologically to a living genus, it should be given the name of that genus with the addition of the termination "-ites".

A discussion then took place in which Professor di Caporiacco (Italy), M. Chavan (France) and Professor van Straelen (Belgium) took part. In the course of this discussion certain difficulties were foreseen in the application of a special system of nomenclature for fossil fragments of invertebrates independent of, but co-ordinated in some way with, the existing system of zoological nomenclature.

At the conclusion of this discussion THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, though it was evident that there were great difficulties in the way of accepting the plan formulated by Croneis to which M. Deflandre had drawn attention, the problem presented by these fossil fragments was a real one and deserved careful consideration. For himself, it seemed possible that the solution should be looked for in the field of technical terminology rather than in that of zoological nomenclature. The Section were grateful to M. Deflandre for having brought this matter to their attention. The communication which he had been good enough to make would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet: proposed procedure in regard to

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a number of interesting propositions which he desired to lay before the Commission and the Congress[8]. Since his arrival in Paris he had been so fortunate as to be able to have a full discussion with Professor Bonnet in regard to the procedure to be adopted in the handling of these propositions. As a result, he had agreed that the first of these propositions, which was concerned with the

[8] For the text of the proposals submitted by Professor Bonnet, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 171—179.

status of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757 in his *Aranei svecici*, a matter to which Professor Bonnet and his colleagues attached the greatest importance, should be brought before the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature at the first opportunity during the present Congress. The remaining propositions were concerned with various aspects of the *Règles* and included a number of proposals for drafting amendments and additions. In so far as time permitted, these would be dealt with by the Commission during its Paris Session and proposals in regard to them would be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval. Any of Professor Bonnet's proposals which could not be dealt with in this way would be considered by the Commission after the close of the Congress and decisions reached as promptly as possible. He proposed therefore now to call upon Professor Bonnet to present his communication in regard to Clerck's Arachnid names.

PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he was grateful to the President for the arrangements which he had proposed for handling the communications which he had submitted to the Commission. Those arrangements were perfectly satisfactory to him.

Proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in Clerck, 1757, *Aranei Svecici* notwithstanding that that work was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature

6. PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he desired to bring forward a proposal relating to the status of the names of spiders published by Clerck in 1757 in his work entitled *Aranei svecici*[9]. This was a matter to which he and the Arachnologists associated with him attached an altogether outstanding importance. He would, he believed, be able to show that their claim that these names should be accorded rights under the Law of Priority was thoroughly well founded. What he was asking for was that these names should be recognised, notwithstanding the fact that they were published in 1757 and were thus anterior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. It was a matter of indifference to him whether this end were achieved through the addition of a special saving clause to Article 26 or by any other means.

Before submitting the present application, he had consulted the entire body of specialists at present engaged in the study of Arachnology in any part of the world. Of the 62 workers concerned, replies had been received from 54. Of those who had replied, 48 had expressed themselves as in favour of the present petition, while four were opposed and two did not consider themselves sufficiently experienced to justify them in expressing an opinion.

[9] For the text of Professor Bonnet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 173—176.

Clerck's work contained the generic name *Araneus* and the oldest names for 54 species of spider; the species concerned were very common and they were to-day habitually known by Clerck's names. What was sought was the grant of official approval for this practice. If this request were now to be rejected, arachnological nomenclature would be plunged into a state of anarchy, for it could not be doubted that the specialists who now used the names published by Clerck would continue to do so, while those who were anxious to use those names but at present did not do so would use different names for the species concerned, though it would be necessary for such authors to cite also the names of Clerck in order to make clear the species to which they were referring. The recognition of the names published for spiders by Clerck would confer a great benefit on the nomenclature of Arachnology and would redound greatly to the credit of the nomenclaturists of 1948.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that he desired to support the proposal submitted by Professor Bonnet. The names published by Clerck were in almost universal use and it would be a grave error to cast the nomenclature of the group into confusion by a rigid adherence to the letter of the *Règles*. There was, in his view, a clear case for the grant of the relief sought by arachnologists.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVÁN (FRANCE) said that, while the present application was primarily one of interest to arachnologists, it was of great interest also to malacologists, for there was a book containing names of species of the Phylum Mollusca which was in a position very similar to that of Clerck's *Aranei svecici*. Malacologists were therefore much concerned in the outcome of the present application.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the problem presented by the spider names published by Clerck in 1757 had been the subject of argument since long before the adoption in 1901 of the present *Règles*. The decision taken at that time had given an absolute force to the Law of Priority but it had not been long before it had become apparent that the rigidity so imposed was insupportable and in consequence the Congress had decided at Monaco in 1913 to provide a means by which the Law of Priority could in certain circumstances be relaxed through the use by the Commission of the plenary powers then conferred by the Congress under which the Commission was

authorised to suspend the *Règles* where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise result. It was unfortunate that the present problem had not long ago been submitted to the Commission with a request that it should be dealt with under the plenary powers, for in a case of this sort nothing but added difficulty resulted from delay in seeking a decision from the Commission. Professor Bonnet had referred to the eminent French Arachnologist, M. Simon, who had himself been a member of the Commission from 1915 to 1921. The early records of the Commission had unfortunately been destroyed many years ago but there were indications in the surviving records which suggested that M. Simon had sought in some way to secure that this problem should be brought before the Commission. If such efforts had been made, they had apparently been unsuccessful. The present application was one which would certainly have commanded his enthusiastic support and it was fitting therefore that it should be at a meeting of the Congress held in Paris that this problem should be brought forward for final decision.

If the Section were to decide in principle that the present application should be granted, there would still remain a difficult choice regarding the method to be adopted for that purpose. He (the President) felt that it would be of advantage if further discussion of this application could be deferred to a later meeting in order that in the meanwhile the question of the means to be adopted for giving the relief desired, if such were decided upon by the Section, might be further studied. The case presented unusual features and it was desirable that the Section should be fully seized of all relevant considerations before they came to take a decision on the application submitted. He proposed therefore to hand the papers relating to this case to Professor di Caporiacco so that, when the Commission and the Section next considered this matter, he might be able to give a fuller *exposé* of the issues involved than had been possible at the present meeting. He hoped that this procedure would be agreeable to Professor Bonnet and to the Section as a whole.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Minute* 4)

THE SECTION agreed to defer until a later meeting the further consideration of the proposal that means should be found to make available under the *Règles* the Arachnid names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding the fact that that work was published prior to 1758, i.e., prior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

Work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period 1935-1948

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on its work during the period of thirteen years which had elapsed since the close of the meeting held in Lisbon in September, 1935. A detailed Report on this subject (Commission Paper **(I.C.48)2**) had been prepared by the Secretary to the Commission and this, the Commission proposed, should be submitted to the Congress at the same time as the Report on their work during the present Congress which they would themselves be submitting at a later meeting of the Section. The more important of the developments which had occurred between the Lisbon and Paris Congresses would be referred to in that Report, but the Commission felt that, in advance of the circulation of that Report, it would be convenient to the Section to be furnished with an account of the chief developments which had taken place since 1935.

The following is a summary of the statement then made by the President on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

At the close of the Lisbon meeting the Secretaryship to the Commission had fallen vacant through the resignation of that Office by Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) after a distinguished tenure of office which had extended over a period of 38 years. The Commission had asked Dr. Stiles to officiate as Acting Secretary until the election of his successor. This had taken place in October, 1936, when Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) had been elected to be Secretary. In consequence, the Secretariat of the Commission had then been transferred from Washington to London.

At the end of the year 1937 the Class 1937 completed its term of service and the Commission accordingly constituted a new Class (Class 1946), to which they elected the retiring members of the time-expired Class 1937, namely Commissioners Arndt, Calman, Esaki, Hankó, Jaczewski and Stiles.

In the early part of 1939 two additional Offices had been created by the Commission. The first, that of Vice-President, had been filled by the election thereto of Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), while the second, that of Assistant Secretary, had been accepted by Commissioner James L. Peters (U.S.A.). On the death of Commissioner Stiles Commissioner Peters had been elected to be Vice-President.

It was naturally not possible for much work to be done during the period of about twelve months in which the Secretaryship was vacant but Dr. Stiles was nevertheless

able to arrange for the publication of one instalment of *Opinions*. The considerable task of transferring the Secretariat to its new headquarters, involving as it did the sorting of records, the introduction of a new system of registering and filing documents, the provision of accommodation, and the raising of funds, occupied the greater part of the period from 1936 to 1939, but in spite of these difficulties some progress was made with the consideration of current problems of nomenclature.

A situation of the utmost gravity for the Commission arose on the outbreak of war in Europe in September, 1939. Two measures of importance were then taken to ward against the dangers confronting the Commission. In the first place, arrangements were made to evacuate the vital records of the Commission from London to a place of safety in the country until such time as it was possible to judge of the effect of the expected air attacks on London. Having thus done everything possible to assure the safety of the physical assets of the Commission, it was necessary next to consider what measures were needed to ensure the continued existence of the Commission during the dangerous times lying ahead. The chief dangers to be apprehended were the risk that the Secretary to the Commission might be killed in an air attack and second that, if the war were to be protracted, the losses in personnel likely to be suffered through the lapsing of the Classes into which it was divided, supplemented by the deaths of Commissioners through old age or other causes, might so deplete the strength of the Commission that it would be a matter of great difficulty to restore the Commission to activity after the war was finished. Acting in consultation with the Secretary and after the best legal advice had been obtained, the President accordingly decided to assume for the duration of the war such extraordinary powers as might be necessary to ensure the continued existence of the Commission as a body. For this purpose he had executed an instrument entitled "Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939". Acting under the powers so assumed, the President in due course constituted the Class 1949 to replace the time-expired Class 1940 and later the Class 1952 to replace the Class 1943, appointing to the new Classes the members of the Classes which had completed their term of service. As so constituted, the Class 1949 included Señor Angel Cabrera, Mr. Frederick Chapman, Mr. Francis Hemming, Dr. Karl Jordan, Professor J. Pellegrin and Professor R. Richter, while the Class 1952 included Dr. A. do Amaral, Professor L. di Caporiacco, Professor J. R. Dymond, Dr. James L. Peters, there having

been two vacancies in the former Class 1943. Under the same powers, the President confirmed in their offices those members of the Commission who held offices of the Commission when those offices fell vacant upon the completion of the term of service of the Commissioners by whom they had been held at the outbreak of the war. In assuming these extraordinary powers, the President had stipulated that any action taken thereunder should be reported to the Commission as soon as possible after the close of hostilities and further that the Commission should furnish a report thereon to the Congress at its next meeting in order that the Congress should be fully informed of the action taken and should have an opportunity of expressing their approval of that action in the same way that the Budapest Congress of 1927 gave their approval to certain somewhat similar action taken by the then Secretary to the Commission after the close of the war of 1914–18.

At the close of the year 1946 the Class 1946 completed its term of service and the Commission constituted in its place the Class 1955, electing thereto four of the retiring members of the Class 1946 (namely Commissioners Boschma, Calman, Hankó, Stoll). The future position of two members of the former Class 1946 was reserved for further consideration, in the case of Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan), because of circumstances arising out of the late war, in the case of Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland), because his whereabouts at that time were unknown.

When the Lisbon Congress closed in September, 1935, there were two vacancies in the membership of the Commission, of which one was due to the death of Commissioner Anton Handlirsch (Austria). Between the Lisbon Congress and the outbreak of war in 1939, the Commission had suffered two further losses through the death first of Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) and later of Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.). As was to be expected, other similar losses occurred during the war, though it was not possible to ascertain the total extent of these losses until the war was over. It was then found that five members of the Commission had died since the outbreak of the war, namely Commissioners C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.), Frederick Chapman (Australia), Walther Arndt (Germany), Jacques Pellegrin (France). The deaths of these old and valued colleagues were a severe loss to the Commission. The death of Commissioner Arndt came as an especial blow, for his death was due not to natural causes but was caused by the action of the Gestapo by whom, during the war, he was arrested and executed for no other reason apparently than his

intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between men of science, irrespective of nationality.

In addition, the Commission lost three members through resignation in the period which had elapsed since their meeting in Lisbon in 1935. The Commissioners concerned were : Karl Apstein (Germany) ; Filippo Silvestri (Italy) ; Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain). Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) had already resigned at the time of the Lisbon Congress.

All the vacancies which occurred in the membership of the Commission between the close of the Lisbon meeting in September, 1939, and the outbreak of war were filled by the election of new Commissioners. In all, six Commissioners were so elected, namely : Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) *vice* the late Commissioner A. Handlirsch (Austria) ; Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) *vice* Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) (resigned) ; Professor Walther Arndt (Germany) *vice* Commissioner Karl Apstein (Germany) (resigned) ; Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) *vice* Commissioner F. Silvestri (Italy) (resigned) ; Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) *vice* Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) (deceased) ; Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) *vice* Commissioner Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain) (resigned). The following additional elections were made either during the war or since the close of hostilities to fill vacancies in the membership of the Commission : Professor James Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.) ; Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner L. Stejneger (U.S.A.) ; Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) ; Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) *vice* the late Commissioner F. Chapman (Australia) ; Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) *vice* the late Commissioner W. Arndt (Germany) ; Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) *vice* the late Professor J. Pellegrin (France) ; Dr. Paul Rode (France) *vice* the former Commissioner T. Jaczewski (Poland).

The interruption in international communications caused by the war had been so serious that it was felt that it would not be correct to proceed with the rendering of *Opinions* on current problems of nomenclature. This did not mean, however, that no *Opinions* were rendered during that period, for on the outbreak of war in 1939 there were 45 cases on which decisions had been taken by the Commission at Lisbon on which no *Opinion* had been rendered. During the war *Opinions* were rendered and published on all these cases. In addition, certain cases which had been submitted

to the Commission for vote before the outbreak of war and on which therefore every Commissioner had had an opportunity of expressing his views were completed and *Opinions* rendered on them. Altogether 71 *Opinions* had been rendered since the meeting of the Commission held in Lisbon in 1935. These *Opinions* were: (a) *Opinions* 124–133, for the publication of which by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, arrangements had been made by Dr. Stiles during the period in which he was officiating as Acting Secretary to the Commission; (b) *Opinions* 134–181, in which were embodied decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935; (c) *Opinions* 182–194, dealing with matters on which decisions had been reached since the Lisbon meeting. A start had been made also with the re-publication of the older *Opinions* which had long been out of print and of which copies had become unobtainable. *Opinions* 1–16 had been re-published in this way. Explanatory editorial notes had been added drawing attention to certain features of those *Opinions* which had been modified by later decisions of the Commission or the Congress. It was proposed during the present meeting to place proposals before the Section for the integration into the *Règles* of the *Opinions* already rendered by the Commission; the adoption of the proposals of the Commission under this head would make it possible to dispense with editorial notes of this kind when the remaining *Opinions* came to be re-published.

In addition to publishing the *Opinions* described above, the Commission had published during the war twelve resolutions on various important questions affecting nomenclatorial practice which had been adopted at various times by the Commission or the Congress, many of which had been largely overlooked by reason of not having been published except in the somewhat inaccessible volumes of the proceedings of successive meetings of the Congress. The resolutions so published had been grouped in a series to which the title *Declaration* had been given, to distinguish it from the series of *Opinions*.

When in 1939 it had been decided that the Commission should in future itself publish its own publications, it was decided also that the *Opinions* of the Commission should be issued in a succession of volumes of a single work entitled "Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature." Publication started in August, 1939, when the Commission published the first three parts of volume 2 of the above work, of which volume 1 was reserved for the re-publication of the earlier *Opinions* published at different times between 1907 and 1936. Publication of this volume was started in 1943, at which

time the title of the work was extended to include a reference also to the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission. In 1944 it was decided to reserve the remainder of volume 2, of which by that time 26 Parts had been published, for the *Opinions* recording the decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935, and to start publication of volume 3, containing the *Opinions* adopted since the Lisbon meeting, the two volumes to be published concurrently.

It was only to be expected that the profound dislocation resulting from the war should have created serious difficulties for the Commission as for all other international scientific bodies. Every effort had, however, been made by the Secretary to the Commission not only to keep in close touch with all the available members of the Commission but also by the publication of papers containing interim accounts of the current work of the Commission and its Secretariat and by a very extensive correspondence with specialists in all parts of the world with which postal communications with Great Britain were then open to keep zoologists as fully informed as possible of what was in progress and to maintain their interest in the international regulation of zoological nomenclature. The success of these efforts could be judged by the rapid growth in the number of applications submitted to the Commission and in the volume of the scientific correspondence of the Commission during the later years of the war and in the period which had since elapsed. Further, wherever, as in the United States and elsewhere, groups of specialists had established committees for the study of zoological nomenclature in relation to their specialities, the Secrêtary to the Commission had entered into relations with the committees so formed and had done everything possible to foster co-operation between those committees and the Commission. This policy, which had been formally adopted by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 when they had adopted the resolution which had since been embodied in *Declaration* 10, clearly offered great opportunities for valuable progress on co-operative lines, a considerable number of interesting and valuable contributions having already been made to the work of the Commission by bodies of this sort established in the United States and Great Britain.

Administrative and financial problems were a constant source of anxiety to the Commission, for when the Secretariat of the Commission was transferred to London consequent upon the election of the present Secretary, the Commission had possessed no funds of any kind, its small out-of-pocket expenses having previously been met from

an annual grant made not to the Commission but personally to the previous Secretary by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., the same institution at the same time undertaking the publication of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission. The first task after the transfer of the Secretariat to Europe had therefore been to raise a small preliminary fund with which to finance the initial activities of the Commission in the new phase of existence on which it was entering.. Some three hundred pounds (£300) had been raised in this way by donations made to the Commission by the Royal Society of London and other learned societies in London. The funds so received were most valuable as providing the means for making a start with the work of the Commission but they were obviously inadequate to meet the cost even of discharging the obligations in the matter of publications to which the Commission must regard itself as being committed if it was to work off the arrears of work with which it was already confronted. It was in the hope of raising the funds necessary to carry through this limited programme that in 1943 the Secretary to the Commission issued an appeal for a fund of £1,800. The success of this appeal put an end to the immediate anxieties of the Commission and the situation was further greatly improved when the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation made a conditional grant in 1947 up to a maximum of $10,900 and a similar grant up to a maximum of $10,600 for the year 1948.

It had to be recognised, however, that the basis on which the Commission was now operating was extremely precarious, for while the grants made by UNESCO covered essential office expenditure and greatly assisted the Commission's publications, the central problem facing the Commission remained entirely untouched. The entire functioning of the Commission depended at present upon the efforts of the the Honorary Secretary who was not only an unpaid part-time officer but was able to give to the service of the Commission only his spare time in the evenings and at week-ends, his days being necessarily devoted to earning his livelihood in an entirely different occupation. The work of the office of the Commission had now grown to dimensions which, if the work were to be discharged promptly and efficiently, called for the employment of a whole-time salaried official, who would have not only to be thoroughly acquainted with the problems of zoological nomenclature but should himself also be a specialist in the systematics of some branch of the Animal Kingdom, for without the knowledge which could only be obtained in this way no such official could properly perform the

duties which would fall to him to discharge. Before such an official could be appointed and could take over the bulk of the duties discharged by the present spare-time honorary Secretary, the Commission would need not only to have funds sufficient to pay the substantial salary which any zoologist possessing the requisite qualifications would have to be given but also to be in possession of an income sufficiently assured to enable it to offer a reasonable degree of security of tenure to any zoologist to whom the post might be offered. At present the Commission's funds were entirely insufficient to cover the cost of the salary of such an official. Even if this difficulty could be overcome, the sources of the income of the Commission were far from assured, the greater part consisting of a grant made from year to year by UNESCO, which in the present state of international affairs could not be regarded as providing the security that was necessary before the Commission could appoint a highly qualified whole-time official. For the time being, the present honorary Secretary was prepared to continue to give his spare time to the work of the Commission, but obviously this arrangement could not be looked upon as permanent. When it came to an end the Commission—and zoologists who looked to the Commission for assistance in their work—would be confronted with the likelihood of the complete breakdown of the machinery of the Commision unless in the meanwhile effective steps had been taken to meet the situation so created. The present Secretary had done everything in his power to bring this serious problem to the attention of leading zoological institutions but it must be admitted that, while most anxious that the work of the Commission should continue without interruption and indeed desirous of seeing it expanded in various directions, not a single one of the great institutions to which this matter had been submitted had as yet taken any effective steps to deal with the problem. In zoological nomenclature, as in private life, people could not expect indefinitely to get something for nothing. False hopes of this kind could only lead to the discontinuance of the services at present being rendered free of cost. The problem was therefore one of the utmost gravity and importance to every zoologist interested in the maintenance of international regulation in the field of zoological nomenclature. This question was thus brought before the present Congress as one which called for immediate and effective action by those zoologists who held the principal posts in the national museums of natural history in different parts of the world, for it was only the zoologists who held such posts who were in a position to concert the necessary action.

Notwithstanding the great difficulties created by the war, a development of outstanding importance was initiated in the year 1943, when it was decided to establish on behalf of the Commission a journal which would be the Official Organ of the Commission. The journal so founded, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, had received a warm welcome and had reached a stage at which its printing costs were covered by the receipts from sales. This result had been achieved only be setting at a high level the price charged for individual parts. This policy had been subject to a certain amount of criticism on the part of zoologists who were accustomed to obtaining other scientific journals at a much lower cost. The zoologists who argued in favour of a reduction in the prices charged had failed however to demonstrate that the loss involved could be made good by increased subscriptions. On the face of it, it was most unlikely that this result would be achieved, for it was notorious that in existing world conditions the demand for scientific publications was extremely inelastic. Nevertheless, it was clearly desirable on general grounds that the publications of the Commission should be sold at the lowest practicable prices and thus made available to the widest possible circle of zoologists. As an experiment, therefore, a portion of the grant from UNESCO earmarked for publications would be used for reducing the price charged for the Commission's publications. This experiment would be continued so long as the necessary funds were provided by UNESCO, but should those funds cease to be available the policy would have to be reconsidered if in the meantime sales had not increased sufficiently to cover production costs.

Two other plans of importance were launched in the year 1943, the first being that for the publication of the substantive French text of the *Règles*, which had long been out of print, with an accurate translation into English, which did not at that time exist, the English translation in common use being imperfect in many ways, being both incomplete in certain respects and containing also serious errors of translation. Considerable progress had been achieved in the preparation of this edition and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers. A grant towards the cost of printing had been received from the Royal Society of London. The project had, however, been put on one side until after the present Congress, it being considered that zoologists would prefer to see publication postponed until after the present Congress so that the new edition might take account of any amendments to the *Règles* that might be adopted at Paris.

The second of the two projects started in 1943 was the publication, in book form, of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," which had become virtually useless as an instrument for the stabilisation of generic nomenclature through not being accessible in the form of a single volume. The task of preparing this work for publication had been extremely arduous, the Secretary having found it necessary to verify every bibliographical reference given in the *Opinions*, by means of which names had been placed on the " Official List," many of which were found to be incorrect, and also to ascertain the original place of publication of the large number of names placed on, or otherwise cited in, the " Official List," for which no bibliographical references had been given in the *Opinions* concerned. The greater part of this task had, however, now been completed and a substantial portion of the " Official List " was already in the hands of the printer. A grant towards the cost of printing had been made in this case also by the Royal Society of London, and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers.

The multifarious developments in the work of the Commission since the outbreak of war in 1939 had made it necessary to give careful consideration to the financial structure to be adopted for the ordering of the affairs of the Commission. From the moment in 1938 when the Commission first became possessed of any funds at all, a firm of professional Chartered Accountants had been employed to audit the accounts every year and the accounts so audited had been published in the Commission's *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, together with an explanatory report. The fact however that the Commission, being an unincorporated body, possessed no juridical personality of its own and could not enter into any form of contract became increasingly unsatisfactory, as the scale of the activities of the Commission gathered momentum, for the absence of an incorporated status for the Commission had meant that it had been necessary for the Secretary to the Commission personally to assume financial responsibility for all actions taken in the name of the Commission. The situation so created clearly could not be allowed to continue, and accordingly, after consultation with all the members of the Commission, steps were taken by the Secretary to form a corporation under United Kingdom law which would assume full responsibility for the management of the funds of the Commission. It was not found possible actually to incorporate the Commission, for, owing to its international character, there were not a sufficient number of members of the Commission available to attend business meetings of the Corporation. In order to get over this difficulty it was

agreed that the corporation should include among its members the minimum number of persons normally resident in the United Kingdom necessary to ensure a quorum at meetings in addition to all the members of the Commission. The Articles of Association of the corporation were so drafted as to ensure that the Trust, when dealing with funds contributed for the purposes of the Commission, should be empowered only to expend those funds on purposes approved by the Commission, which was therefore assured of full control over the expenditure of those funds. The corporation so constituted was formally brought into existence at the beginning of 1947 with the title "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature." The chairmanship of the Trust was accepted by the Right Hon. Walter Elliot, a former British Cabinet Minister. The Secretary to the Commission was Managing Director and Secretary of the Trust.

Ever since the end of the war it had been evident that the present Congress would be of outstanding importance, and that if any early reforms were to be made in zoological nomenclature they must be made on that occasion, for it was the Congress alone which possessed authority to modify the *Règles*. Particular efforts had therefore been made by the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain, by correspondence and personal discussion, the general wishes of zoologists regarding the directions in which the *Règles* could be improved and clarified, the membership of the Commission placed on a more genuinely international and representative basis and its procedure so reformed as to enable it to function in an efficient and businesslike manner. This preparatory work had been greatly assisted by a visit paid by the Secretary to the United States and Canada at Christmas, 1947. This visit had been undertaken at the invitation of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, which had made a grant also towards the travelling expenses so incurred. This visit had been of exceptional value and interest, for it had made it possible for the Secretary to hold a conference with the United States members of the Commission as well as to hold extensive and comprehensive discussions with the specialists at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, the American Museum of Natural History, New York, and the Chicago Museum of Natural History and with the large gathering of zoologists attending the annual meeting at Chicago of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the equally representative gathering of palaeontologists attending the annual meeting at Ottawa of the Paleontological Society of America held during the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America. By means of these discussions it had been

possible both to ascertain the directions in which, in the view of the American workers concerned, further progress was desirable, and also to place before those specialists particulars of the subjects proposed to be raised at the Paris Congress. Nothing could have been of greater value to the Commission than these discussions, for they placed it in possession of the views of American workers in a way which would otherwise have been quite impossible of achievement, a consideration which was of especial importance in view of the fact that the Congress was to meet in the following year and that its place of meeting was to be in Europe.

THE PRESIDENT added that, while the account which he had given of the work of the Commission and of its Secretariat during the 13 years which had elapsed since the last meeting of the Congress covered all the main points of importance, the Report prepared by the Secretary to the Commission dealt with these questions much more fully and would be found to contain information on a large number of other matters of interest. The report which he had just made contained no proposals for action. It was proposed, however, as the next item on the agenda, to present a short oral report from the Commission, in which would be included a number of specific proposals which the Commission desired to bring before the Section and for which they sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the work of the Commission and its Secretariat during the period of 13 years between the close in 1935 of the meeting of the Congress held in Lisbon and the opening of the present Congress and agreed that the detailed Report on these matters prepared by the Secretary to the Commission should be presented to the Congress at the same time as the Report to be prepared by the Commission on the work carried out during the present meeting of the Congress.

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on action taken at its present (Paris) Session in regard to matters of personnel and recommendations on such matters submitted to the Congress for approval

8. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, now that the Section had been furnished with a full report on all matters of importance which had arisen in connection with the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period between the close of the Lisbon Congress in September, 1935, and the opening of the present Congress in July, 1948, he proposed to lay before the Section a report on the action taken by the Commission during its present Session in regard to various matters affecting its personnel and allied questions and at the same time to submit various recommendations in

regard to questions arising in this field, for which the Commission sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

The Section would recall that at previous meetings of the Congress the International Commission had devoted a portion of their Report to a description of the changes in the personnel of the Commission which had occurred since the last meeting of the Congress and had included in the same portion of their Report such recommendations in regard to matters of this kind as they desired to submit for approval, first by the Section and second by the Congress in *Concilium Plenum.* On this occasion also the Commission proposed to deal with these matters in the Report which they would lay before the Section at a later meeting, but they felt that, in view of the fact that it had happily been possible to arrange for a substantially larger number of meetings of the Section than had been customary on previous occasions, it would be both more courteous to the Section and more suited to the general convenience if on the present occasion they were to submit to the Section the recommendations for which they desired the approval of the Section and the Congress before they drafted the portion of their Report dealing with this subject. Their task in preparing that document would clearly be greatly simplified if they knew in advance that their recommendations in this field had already received the approval of the Section. For the Section, also, the Commission believed that the procedure now adopted would prove agreeable, affording, as it did, the maximum opportunity for discussion on any proposal on which such discussion might be desired.

The first matter which it was the duty of the Commission to report to the Section was that to their great regret they had received a notification from their old friend and highly esteemed colleague Commissioner Karl Jordan of his desire to be relieved of the burden of the presidency of the Commission on account of advancing years and the misfortune of almost total deafness. Dr. Jordan had been a member of the Commission continuously for a period of 35 years, having been first elected a Commissioner at the meeting of the Congress held at Monaco in 1913. Of that period he had been the President of the Commission for 19 years, having been elected to that Office in 1929 following the death of his eminent Italian predecessor, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. First as an individual member of the Commission and later as its President, Dr. Jordan had brought to the service of the Commission a wealth of knowledge and a wisdom of counsel which had been of the greatest value. On succeeding to the presidency

he had added to these a high sense of judicial impartiality which had been of the utmost service to the Commission and had greatly contributed to its prestige and authority. The Section would be glad to learn that, although Dr. Jordan would no longer be the President of the Commission, he had consented to remain one of its members. The Commission hoped therefore that for many years to come they would have the benefit of Dr. Jordan's ripe knowledge and experience. The Section felt that it would be the wish of the Congress to confer upon Dr. Jordan some signal mark of the high appreciation in which they held him, and they accordingly desired to suggest that the Congress should create, on an *ad hoc* basis, an Office of Honorary Life President and should offer that Office to Dr. Jordan as a mark of their esteem and respect.

To fill the presidency left vacant by the retirement of Dr. Jordan, the Commission recommended the election thereto of Dr. James Lee Peters (U.S.A.), who had been a member of the Commission since 1933 and Vice-President since 1947. The Commission felt confident that the impartiality and dignity of this high Office would be in safe keeping in Dr. Peters' hands and they warmly commended to the Section and to the Congress their proposal that he should be elected to be their new President.

The Commission had nominated Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President in the place of Commissioner James L. Peters, on the election of the latter to be President. The Commission commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

The Commission had decided to abolish the Office of Assistant Secretary, as at present constituted, and to make the title of " Assistant Secretary " available for an honorary (spare-time) personal assistant to the honorary (spare-time) Secretary.

The Commission had next to report that, owing to the absence of President Jordan for the reasons which had already been explained and of Vice-President Peters which was due to various reasons outside his control, the only Officer of the Commission in attendance at the present Session was their Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming, to whom, therefore, had fallen the duty of officiating as Acting President of the Commission during the present Congress.

The high cost of travel, the difficulties arising from the exchange control imposed by many countries and other disturbing factors resulting from the recent world war, had made it impossible for a number of the members of the Commission to attend the present Congress. Of the total

membership, the following five were in attendance: Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands); Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.); Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy); Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom); M. Paul Rode (France). Up to the last moment Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) had fully intended to be present but almost on the eve of his departure from Copenhagen for Paris he had been ordered by his medical advisers to abandon the journey. Dr. Mortensen had been a member of the Congress for many years and was held in the highest esteem not only by his colleagues on the Commission but also by his many friends in the general body of the Congress. The Commission had sent Dr. Mortensen a telegram expressing their great regret at his absence and the reasons which had made it unavoidable, and they felt sure that the Section and the Congress would wish to associate themselves in this message of sympathy and affection.

In accordance with the procedure approved by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology held at Budapest in 1927 and confirmed by the subsequent meetings of the Congress, the Commission had taken steps to invite certain eminent and representative zoologists of various nationalities to act as Alternate Members of the Commission during its present Session in the place of Commissioners who for one reason or another were unable to be present. The members of the Congress so appointed to be Alternate Members of the Commission were:—Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Commissioner Angel Cabrera (Argentina); Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom); Professor Arthur Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil); Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.); Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.); Mr. Norman D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Commissioner W. T. Calman (United Kingdom); Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark); Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Commissioner R. Richter (Germany); Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.). No Alternate Members had as yet been appointed in the place of the following Commissioners who were unable to attend the present Congress:—Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada); Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary); Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia).

The Commission considered it a matter of the utmost importance that every possible measure should be taken to maintain and strengthen the bonds between the Commission on the one hand and the general body of zoologists

on the other. In particular, the Commission attached the greatest significance to the establishment of close and harmonious relations between itself and the members of the Congress on those occasions when the Commission and the Congress were meeting concurrently. Inspired by these motives, the Commission had decided at their first meeting that all their meetings during the present Congress should be held in public and thus thrown open to every member of the Congress. This decision, which had been posted on the Notice Board of the Congress, had received a warm welcome from the members of the Congress. It had given the Commission the opportunity of bringing into close personal consultation leading zoologists present at the Congress and it had enabled those zoologists actively to participate in the work of the Commission and thus become better acquainted both with the problems involved and with the spirit in which the Commission approached its task.

The Commission had next the sad duty to report the death since the last meeting of the Congress of seven of their members. Of these six had died from old age or other natural causes, while one was brutally murdered during the war by the Gestapo in Berlin. The Commissioners concerned were: Dr. H. B. Fantham (Canada); Dr. Witmer Stone (U.S.A.); Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.); Dr. Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.); Mr. Frederick Chapman (Australia); Dr. Walther Arndt (Germany); Professor Jacques Pellegrin (France). The Commission felt sure that the Section would wish to mark their respect for their colleagues who had died during the period 1935–1948 by rising in their places and standing in silence for two minutes.

(*The members of the Section on Nomenclature then rose in their places and stood for two minutes in silence to mark their respect for the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who had died during the period* 1935–1948.)

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT said that the Commission felt certain that the Section on Nomenclature and the entire Congress would wish emphatically to condemn the abominable crime which had robbed them of their colleague Dr. Walther Arndt, who, the mildest and most inoffensive of men and one who had devoted his whole life and much of his fortune to the advancement of science, had been hurriedly arrested in Berlin during the war and had suffered death by the headman's axe. This disgraceful murder, which was apparently due to no other reason than Dr. Arndt's intellectual integrity and to his attachment to

the conception of co-operation between men of science irrespective of nationality, was an ineffaceable outrage on the whole body of men of science. The Commission proposed therefore to refer especially to this matter in the Report which they would later submit to the Section.

In the report by the Secretary to the Commission on the work of that body during the period 1935–1948 which had already been presented, the Section had been informed of the elections made by the Commission during that period to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation, or by the expiry of the term of service of Classes in the membership of the Commission. The Commission asked the Section and the Congress to approve and confirm the election of the Commissioners concerned.

The Section had also been furnished by the Secretary with particulars of the extraordinary powers assumed by the President on the outbreak of war in 1939 for the purpose of assuring the continued existence of the Commission in the dangerous period into which it was then entering, and of the action taken by the President under those powers. The Commission were certain that the Section would wish to commend the vigorous and effective action taken by the President in this matter and would give it their retrospective approval.

The Commission had also to report that they had lost touch with one of their members, Professor T. Jaczewski (Poland), who, through the circumstances of the recent war, had become a Displaced Person. In the circumstances, the Commission had thought it right to treat Professor Jaczewski's place on the Commission as having become vacant in like manner as though he had died or had resigned. The Commission sought the approval of the Section both for the action so taken and also for the adoption of permanent regulations authorising the adoption of similar action if a comparable situation were ever to recur.

The Class 1949 of the membership of the Commission would complete its term of service at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated the following retiring Commissioners to serve for a further term as Commissioners: Cabrera (Argentina); Hemming (United Kingdom); Jordan (United Kingdom); Pearson (Australia). The Commission recommended that in the future, as in the past, one-third of the total membership of the Commission should vacate their position at the end of each meeting of the Congress, the members so retiring being eligible, however, for immediate re-election, but that the system of 9-year Classes should be discontinued as, in view of the irregularity with which meetings of the Congress were held,

this system had outlived its usefulness. In its place the Commission proposed that the names of the members of the Commission should be arranged in the order in which they had been elected or, most recently, been re-elected members, and that at the close of each meeting of the Congress the third part of the Commission comprising the members of the Commission with the longest service since election, or latest re-election, should complete its term of service.

The Commission had also to report that they had nominated Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) to be a member of the Commission, and that he had consented to serve as such. The Commission asked for confirmation of this election.

Each Officer of the Commission vacated his appointment on completion of his term of service as a Commissioner but was eligible for immediate reappointment on being re-elected a member of the Commission. In consequence of this rule, the Secretaryship of the Commission would fall vacant at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) for a further term of Office as Secretary and they commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

A difficult situation had arisen in regard to the position of two of the zoologists who, at the outbreak of war, had been members of the Commission. The Commissioners concerned were : Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany) and Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan). The study of zoology was, or should be, entirely divorced from political considerations, but, in view of the circumstances existing in Germany and Japan respectively immediately before the outbreak of the recent war, the nature of which was well known to all members of the Congress, the Commission, after the most careful consideration, had come to the conclusion that it was desirable to afford to the zoologists of Germany and Japan respectively a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to the zoologists by whom they desired respectively to be represented on the Commission. Pending the completion of this consultation, the Commission did not propose to recommend the re-election of these two Commissioners. The Commission asked the Congress to endorse this recommendation. The Commission, in putting forward the foregoing recommendations, wished to make it clear that the conclusion which they had reached in this matter had been taken on grounds of principle and was not intended to reflect, and did not, in fact, reflect, either upon the professional eminence of Professor Richter or Professor Esaki or upon the value of the services rendered to the

Commission by those zoologists while serving as Commissioners.

Since the last meeting of the Congress the Commission had actively pursued the policy set forth in their *Declaration* 10 of encouraging in every way the establishment of groups of specialists to study problems of zoological nomenclature affecting their own groups. Wherever such groups had been established, the closest possible relations had been established with the Commission through action initiated on their behalf by their Secretary. The Commission looked forward to the time when each of the principal groups of the Animal Kingdom would be covered by a group of this kind and when also the national museums of natural history in each of the principal countries would possess a committee on nomenclature, through which the Commission could obtain an indication of the feeling of zoologists in that institution on current problems as they arose.

A proposal was then moved and seconded that the recommendations submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the personnel of the Commission and matters connected therewith be approved by the Section and submitted to the International Congress of Zoology for approval in *Concilium Plenum*. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section to move an amendment to this proposal, and no member had signified his desire to bring forward such an amendment, THE PRESIDENT then put the foregoing proposal to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Despatch of a telegram to Dr. Karl Jordan offering the office of Honorary Life President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

9. THE PRESIDENT said that now that the Section had approved the proposal of the Commission that a special Office of Honorary Life President of the Commission be created and that this Office be offered to Dr. Karl Jordan on the occasion of his resignation of the Office of President of the Commission, it would, he felt sure, be the wish of the Section that he should address a telegram to Dr. Jordan informing him of the action taken by the Section to mark the affection and esteem in which they held him.

THE SECTION invited the President to telegraph to Dr. Jordan in this sense.

Thanks to UNESCO for financial assistance granted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

10. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their warm appreciation of the interest in, and the understanding of the needs of, the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature shown by UNESCO and their grateful thanks for the munificent subvention made to the funds of the Commission by UNESCO in the year 1947 and for the continuation of that support in the year 1948.

Thanks to donors of contributions to the funds of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

11. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their thanks to all Government Agencies, Museums and other Scientific Institutions, Learned Societies and individual zoologists and palaeontologists in all parts of the world who, during the period 1938–1948, had assisted the work of the Commission by making donations to its funds.

Communication addressed to the Congress on behalf of the Austrian zoologists

12. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that since his arrival in Paris he had received a communication signed jointly by Professor Otto Storch, President of the Zoological Institute of Vienna, Dr. Karl Holdhaus, Director of the Natural History Museum, and Dr. U. Stundral, Secretary-General of the Zoologisch-Botanische Gesellschaft of Vienna, on behalf of the zoologists of Austria. In this communication the Austrian zoologists had expressed the view that a fundamental reform in the *Règles* was required in order to secure that well-known names should not be upset through the operation of the Law of Priority. That such changes should be avoided should, the Austrian zoologists considered, be regarded as a fundamental principle which should be constantly borne in mind. Any changes that might be made in the *Règles* should be founded upon this principle. The Austrian zoologists greatly regretted that circumstances prevented them from attending the present Congress. They asked that no changes involving the reform which they sought should be made in the *Régles* until a later meeting at which they could be present and would prefer that no changes of any kind should be made until such a meeting could be held.

THE PRESIDENT said that all zoologists regretted that, through circumstances arising out of the late war, it was not possible for zoologists of every country to be represented at the present Congress. It was not possible however on this account to put a complete stop upon all progress in the reform of the *Règles*. It was very evident from the attitude of the zoologists attending the present Congress and also from that of many who were unable to be present that zoologists generally would regard both the Commission and the Congress as deserving of blame if at the present Congress they were to fail to make an effort to remove the more obvious of the blemishes in the present *Règles* and to fill in the more obvious of the gaps which marred those *Règles*. The actual proposal which was particularly advocated by the Austrian zoologists, namely, the placing of limitations upon the Law of Priority in the interests of stability in nomenclature, was a matter which was uppermost in the minds of many zoologists in all parts

of the world. The Section had just had a most interesting and illuminating discussion on this very subject on proposals put forward by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) and by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France). Many members of the Section would evidently have liked to see an immediate decision taken on those proposals, but the Section had recognised that, while many zoologists attached the greatest importance to the early recognition of a Law of Prescription imposed for the sake of preserving names in common use, there were others who were not at the present Congress who did not share this view. The Section had therefore—very wisely, as he thought—decided to defer taking a decision on this matter until the next Congress when every group of zoologists would have had a further opportunity of considering the question not as a theoretical but as a practical issue. In the meanwhile the Commission were to undertake a thorough study of the whole problem on the basis of a comprehensive consultation with specialists in all countries. On this issue, which the Austrian zoologists considered to be the most important now awaiting decision, the action which the Section had taken would be completely agreeable to the zoologists of Austria. If the Section approved, he (the President) proposed to write to Professor Storch in the foregoing sense. The communication submitted to the Congress by Professor Storch and his colleagues would be attached to the record of the present discussion, together with the text of whatever reply was sent thereto.

THE SECTION took note of the communication addressed to the Congress by Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria, approved the statement of policy made by the President and invited him to reply to Professor Storch in the terms which he had proposed.

(*For the text of the communication received from Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria and of the President's reply thereto, see Appendix*[10].)

Amendment of the "Règles": proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

13. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he proposed now to invite the Section to turn to what was both the most important and the most responsible of the duties committed to them by the Congress, namely, the examination of proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the amendment of the *Règles*. At former meetings of the Congress the opportunity afforded to the Section for the discussion of such proposals had been very limited, for the fact that the Section had usually held only one meeting during each

[10] See pp. 77—78.

Congress had made it inevitable that the first intimation to the Section of a desire by the Commission to secure a change in the *Règles* was on the presentation by the Commission of the Report which they had prepared for submission to the Congress. It would therefore have been difficult for the Section effectively to dissent from the proposals of the Commission without at the same time rejecting the Report prepared by the Commission. On the present occasion the Commission had charged him on their behalf to submit to the Section an oral statement setting out the recommendations for which they sought the approval of the Section in advance of the preparation of their Report to the Congress. If on any of the questions involved the Section were to take a view different from that recommended, the Commission would consider the matter further before finally deciding upon the terms of their Report to the Congress. The Commission were hopeful however that it would be found that the recommendations now to be submitted would meet with the approval of the Section, for each of those recommendations had been agreed upon by the Commission at a public meeting at which any member of the Congress had been free to be present and which had in fact been attended by the majority of those present at today's meeting of the Section. The fact that every one of the recommendations now submitted had been unanimously adopted and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who attended the meetings concerned was evidence of the wide support which those recommendations commanded.

In a complicated matter such as the consideration of a large number of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* to which the Section had now to address itself, it was essential that there should be no room for doubt as to the exact scope of the changes proposed. It was for this reason that a distribution had been made of the documents which had been before the Commission at the time when the proposals in question were under consideration. Additional copies of these documents were available for any member of the Section who wished to have a copy for his or her personal use.

The programme for the reform of the "Règles" advocated by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The general programme of reform which the Commission hoped to see carried through by the present Congress was outlined in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)1**, and that part of it which was concerned with the amendment of the *Règles* was described in greater detail in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)6**. As would be seen from those papers, the Commission hoped that the Congress would agree (1) to incorporate, subject to certain exceptions and modifications, the

interpretations of the *Règles* given at various times in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission by the insertion in the *Règles* of express provisions dealing with the problems involved; (2) to make such changes in the *Règles* as were necessary either to remove ambiguities or to bring the *Règles* into line with the general wishes of zoologists; (3) to insert provisions embodying the substance of a number of important resolutions adopted by the Congress at various times (and since embodied by the Commission in *Declarations*); (4) to deal with various matters on which the *Règles* were at present silent; (5) to substitute *Recommandations* for mandatory provisions in certain cases; (6) to remove inconsistencies of phraseology which at present marred the *Règles* in various ways. The Commission were of the opinion—which they were confident would be shared by the Section—that the proper course for the Congress would be to concentrate upon taking clear-cut and unambiguous decisions on the questions at issue without attempting to draft the actual provisions which, in order to give effect to their decisions, would need to be inserted in the substantive French text of the *Règles*. Quite apart from the language problem inherent in drafting provisions in one language (French) on the basis of decisions taken in a different language (English), the task of drafting provisions of this sort involved a technical skill and experience inevitably lacked by zoologists. The Commission recommended therefore that this task should be deferred until after the close of the Congress when it should be entrusted to expert jurists. The jurists should be asked also to fill in certain gaps in the substantive French text where at present there was only an English text, and also to prepare a literal English translation of the *Règles* as revised. It was proposed that, when the jurists had prepared a draft French text to give effect to the decisions reached by the Congress, the text so prepared, together with the English translation, should be subject to a close scrutiny to ensure that the wording employed was appropriate from the zoological point of view and to make certain that the text proposed gave effect to the whole of the decisions reached by the Congress but contained no other provisions varying the meaning of the existing *Règles*. The Commission recommended that the duty of undertaking this scrutiny should be entrusted to the Executive Committee of the Commission. Finally it was proposed that, when this scrutiny had been completed and any necessary consequential changes made in the text, the Secretary to the Commission should arrange with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the Corporation which, as the Section would recall, was now responsible for the manage-

The recommendations of the Commission regarding the method to be adopted to give effect to the decisions of the Congress for the reform of the "Règles"

(For a later decision modifying this proposal, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Minute 9)

ment of the business affairs of the Commission) for the publication of the revised *Règles* at the earliest possible moment and that those *Règles* should enter into effect immediately upon being so promulgated. The price to be charged for the revised edition of the *Règles* would be set at the lowest possible level.

The papers relating to the proposed amendment of the *Règles* which had so far been studied by the Commission in conjunction with the members of the Congress who had attended the meetings concerned were Papers **I.C.(48)1** and **5** to **14**. Of these, Paper **I.C.(48)5**, which was concerned with the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the *Règles*, had already been considered by the Section, by whom the recommendations there submitted had been approved. As regards Papers **I.C.(48)1** and **6**, he (the President) had just put before the Section the recommendations of a general character there submitted. He accordingly now proposed to report to the Section the recommendations submitted by the Commission on the basis of their consideration of the remaining Papers (Papers **I.C.(48)7** to **14**), together with certain recommendations on particular points which had been adopted by the Commission in the course of their consideration of Paper **I.C.(48)6**. The recommendations so submitted fell into five groups, with each of which he would deal separately.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Minute* 6)

Meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25

(*a*) The first subject to be considered was the recommendation of the Commission in regard to the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25 of the *Règles*. This problem was discussed in detail in Paper **I.C(48)7.** Over 40 years ago (in *Opinion* 1) the Commission had given a ruling that a generic name published without explanatory matter, without a designated or indicated type but containing two or more previously published nominal species, was not to be regarded as having been published with an "indication". This ruling had been almost completely overlooked and it was evident from a comprehensive inquiry undertaken by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature in Paleontology in America, the results of which had been submitted to the Commission, that an insistence on the interpretation of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 1 would clearly run counter to the wishes of the great majority of workers and that, if this provision were now to be applied, it would lead to widespread confusion in nomenclature through the pointless changes to which such a course would lead. The Commission accordingly proposed that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that a generic name published

prior to 1st January, 1931, in the circumstances described above should be accepted as having been published with an "indication". At the same time the Commission proposed to cancel the relevant portion of *Opinion* 1.

Proposed establishment of rules for the naming of infra-subspecific forms.

(b) The second subject on which the Commission desired to submit proposals to the Congress was the nomenclature of categories of less than specific rank. Already as far back as 1932 the International Congress of Entomology had submitted a recommendation on this subject to the Congress. Unfortunately, the Commission had not been able in the three ensuing years to consider this question with sufficient care to enable them at their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 to submit recommendations to the Congress for the clarification of the *Règles* in this matter. On that occasion the Commission had however requested their Secretary to consult with specialists with a view to the submission by him of a Report, with proposals for the issue by the Commission of an *Opinion* setting out the law in this matter. In accordance with this request, the Secretary had submitted the Report which had been distributed as Paper **I.C.(48)9**. It was to be regretted that sixteen years should have elapsed before the submission to the Congress of concrete proposals on this subject, but it was satisfactory to be able to note that the present scheme had been unanimously adopted by the Commission and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meetings of the Commission at which this subject had been discussed. As regards the form of the action now proposed to be taken, it would be recalled that during the present Session the Commission had made it clear that they were opposed to the growth of a body of case law outside the *Règles*. The Commission proposed therefore that this matter should be dealt with by way of the insertion of substantive provisions in the *Règles* and not, as they had contemplated at Lisbon in 1935, by way of an *Opinion*.

The Report submitted (Paper **I.C.(48)9**) contained an account of the history of this problem, a description of the attitude taken by different groups of zoologists and an analysis of the problems involved, together with proposals for their solution. While it was true that it was not until 1932 that this question had been brought expressly to the attention of the Commission, it was a matter both for surprise and for regret that it had not been raised at a much earlier date, for the difficulty involved was due to an inherent defect in the *Règles* as adopted at Berlin nearly fifty years ago. This difficulty arose from the fact that the *Règles* recognised only one taxonomic category below the species level, while zoologists recognised many

such categories ranging from subspecies based upon variations characteristic of whole populations through minority elements of many kinds down to individual aberrations. Some zoologists interpreted the expression " subspecies " as used in the *Règles* in the normal sense of a population within a given species differentiated by certain characters from other subspecies of that species. Such zoologists regarded other infra-specific forms as falling outside the scope of the *Règles*. Other zoologists regarded the expression " subspecies " as covering for this purpose all categories below the species level. Hence, wide divergencies of practice had arisen and no uniformity could be achieved until the *Règles* themselves were amended so as to recognise two different classes of infra-specific form : (a) the subspecies in the conventional taxonomic sense of a population, and (b) all other subspecific forms, *i.e.* all infra-subspecific forms.

The question which the Commission had had to consider was the status to be given to names published for units of the infra-subspecific class. Here a certain divergence of interest existed, a divergence dependent on the scope of the work of the zoologists concerned. In the first place there were all those zoologists who were concerned with the study of categories down to, and including, the subspecies level but no further. For these zoologists the unqualified grant of rights under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy to names given to minority elements as contrasted with whole populations would constitute a severe handicap, for it would make it necessary for these workers to burden themselves with recording the many thousands of names published for minority elements, for this would be unavoidable if within any given genus such a name might render a name given to a new species or subspecies invalid by reason of its being a homonym of a name previously published for a minority element of some species belonging to the same genus. Such workers were therefore opposed to the unrestricted grant of nomenclatorial status to names published for forms below the subspecies level. On the other hand, there were those zoologists who were interested in the study of infra-subspecific forms, whose work would be gravely embarrassed if there were no provisions in the *Règles* which would ensure that every such form should always be known by the same name (Law of Priority) and that no name should be employed for more than one form within the same genus (Law of Homonymy). Finally, there was a third group which included many workers in the applied fields (*e.g.* economic entomologists), who demanded that means should be found, through appropriate modifications of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy,

to secure that parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species should bear the same name.

The scheme now submitted proposed that these different needs should be met by the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions under which the Laws of Priority and Homonymy should apply both to the names of species and subspecies and also to the names of infra-subspecific forms, but that these Laws should operate independently for each of these two groups. Under this system those zoologists whose work was not concerned with forms below the subspecies level would not need to take any account of names published for infra-subspecific forms, while the needs of those zoologists who on the contrary were interested to secure that names given to forms of this kind should be protected under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy would be met in full. It was an essential part of this scheme that the *Règles* should contain provisions defining for nomenclatorial purposes (1) a name given to a " subspecies " and (2) a name given to an " infra-subspecific form " and that an objective test should be provided to enable zoologists to determine to which of these categories any given name belonged. The test proposed was the evidence provided by the description or other data given in the publication in which the name in question first appeared. In order to ensure the maximum degree of stability for current practice, it was proposed that, in the case of names published prior to the introduction of the scheme (which it was proposed should be as from 1st January, 1951), a less rigorous standard should be applied for determining whether a given name had been proposed for a " subspecies " rather than for an " infra-subspecific form " but that a more rigorous standard should be required in the case of names published after that date. The scheme also contained provisions which would enable a name originally published as the name of a " species " or " subspecies " to take rank as the name of an " infra-subspecific " form when on taxonomic grounds it was considered necessary to treat the form so named as being an " infra-subspecific " form, and which enabled a name originally published as the name of an " infra-subspecific " form to be promoted to be the name of a subspecies (or species) when such promotion was judged to be necessary on taxonomic grounds. In the latter case it was essential that for the purposes of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy the name should rank as the name of a " subspecies " only as from the date on which it was elevated to that category, for otherwise it would still be necessary for workers interested only in the study of categories down to and including the subspecies level to keep a complete record of all names published for " infra-subspecific " forms. It was

PURCHASED
14 JUL 1950

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Parts 1–21 have already been published and the remaining Parts, containing the subject index, are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume has been devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature. Parts 1–6 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

VOLUME 5. Parts 4/6
pp. 63–168.

7th July, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PURCHASED

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

Page

PART 1. *The Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July*, 1948 : Concluding portion of Minutes of the Second Meeting and Minutes of the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Meetings 63–128

PART 2. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Final Plenary Session held in Paris on 27th July*, 1948 : Extracts relating to zoological nomenclature... ... 131

PART 3. *Reports submitted by the Section on Nomenclature and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Final Plenary Session held in Paris on 27th July*, 1948 (first instalment) ... 135–168

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

important that changes in the status of names as between the categories of "subspecific" and "infra-subspecific" name should be recognised as easily, and recorded as quickly, as possible after they had been effected and for this reason it was proposed that *Recommandations* should be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with these aspects of the problem. The scheme now submitted contained also proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions setting out the ideal procedure to be followed by authors when either publishing or subsequently citing names of either category. Finally, the scheme included a proposal that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision giving power to the International Commission, subject to certain conditions, to prescribe technical designations to denote parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species or genera, such designations to be used in preference to any previously published names for the forms in question and to invalidate the use in the genus or genera concerned of the technical designation as a name for any other form. The acceptance of the scheme suggested would call for a reconsideration of the text of Article 2, for, where an infra-subspecific form was attached to a subspecies, a quadrinomial system of nomenclature would be involved.

The plan outlined above would, the Commission believed, provide a workable solution for the complex problem presented by the nomenclature of forms below the species level and one which would meet the, in part, inconsistent, requirements of each of the principal groups of zoologists interested in this matter, while inflicting the minimum amount of inconvenience upon any of these groups. As such, therefore, the Commission warmly commended this scheme to the favourable consideration of the Section and the Congress.

The Law of Homonymy in relation to the names of species, subspecies, and infra-subspecific forms

(c) The third question on which the Commission desired to submit recommendations to the Section and the Congress was concerned with the Law of Homonymy in relation to the names of species and subspecies (and, if the Congress accepted the Commission's proposals in regard to the establishment for nomenclatorial purposes of the category "infra-subspecific form", in relation also to the names of such forms). The issues involved, which were highly complex, were discussed in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)8.** In the case of this matter, there were considerable differences in the current practice of zoologists, and complete agreement as to the best solution to be adopted could not readily be achieved. The paper to which reference had been made accordingly discussed the relative advantages of each of the principal solutions which had been

advocated, in order thereby to clear the ground for a decision as to the solution which possessed the greatest number of advantages while at the same time offering the smallest number of disadvantages.

The problem of specific homonymy was at present dealt with in Articles 35 and 36 of the *Règles*. These Articles were defective, for they were not only marred by very serious omissions but contained also—or were interpreted as containing—a serious ambiguity on one matter of crucial importance, namely, whether a name rejected as a secondary homonym was to be regarded as having been permanently invalidated as the result of such rejection or whether it should be restored when the state of homonymy (on account of which it had been rejected) ceased to exist. In addition, these Articles suffered from a confusion between subjective taxonomic considerations and objective nomenclatorial fact. Moreover, the wording of these Articles was rendered unnecessarily obscure by the use of the expression " specific name " when what was intended was the " trivial name " of a species (the *nomen triviale* of Linnaeus).

Each of the five principal proposals which had been put forward for dealing with this problem was discussed in turn in Paper **I.C.(48)8**. Of these proposals, the first three were clearly less satisfactory than either the fourth or the fifth. Under both the two last-named proposals a name would need to be replaced as a secondary homonym only if at the time of replacement it was considered (on taxonomic grounds) that a condition of homonymy still existed. Names so replaced would be permanently invalidated. As regards primary homonyms, the fourth proposal contemplated that the procedure should be the same as for secondary homonyms, while under the fifth proposal the junior of every pair of primary homonyms would need to be replaced whenever detected, such replacement being permanent. The fourth proposal had the advantage that it would avoid the necessity for the replacement of primary homonyms in those cases where, according to current taxonomic ideas, the two species concerned were not congeneric. The fifth proposal, on the other hand, had the merit that it recognised the need for securing that every species should have as its original name a name consisting of a binominal combination which within the genus concerned was and always had been exclusively its own. The fifth proposal moreover corresponded with the current general practice of zoologists. On balance, therefore, the Commission considered that the fifth proposal was to be preferred to the fourth and they accordingly recommended its acceptance. The Commission proposed that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to

deal separately (a) with names rejected as secondary homonyms prior to the introduction of the revised Articles which they suggested should come into operation as from 1st January, 1951, and (b) with names similarly rejected after that date. The new scheme would apply in its entirety to the latter class of name, but, in the case of names falling in the first of these two classes, a name rejected as a secondary homonym was to be regarded as having been permanently rejected, even if, had the new scheme applied in that case, that rejection would have been incorrect and therefore invalid. This provision, like the corresponding provision included in the scheme for the regulation of names of forms of less than specific rank, had for its object the ensuring of the minimum interference with existing nomenclatorial practice.

In addition to the principal provisions just described, the scheme contained a number of other provisions which were, in the opinion of the Commission, necessary to, or consequential upon, the comprehensive reform of Articles 35 and 36 of the *Règles*. These provisions included: (1) the substitution (here and elsewhere in the *Règles*, where the context so required) of the expressions "specific trivial name" and "subspecific trivial name" for the expressions "specific name" and "subspecific name" and the definition of those expressions; (2) the definition of the expressions "homonym", "primary homonym" and "secondary homonym"; (3) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging authors, on detecting and replacing invalid names, to notify their action to a literature-recording serial such as the "Zoological Record"; (4) the application to subspecific names and subspecific trivial names of the provisions relating to specific names and specific trivial names, subject to a saving clause in favour of the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more named subspecies; (5) a provision requiring the Commission to use its plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* relating to the replacement of secondary homonyms had been misused by an irresponsible or malicious author for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or for providing opportunities for publishing new names or both; (6) a provision that subgeneric names were to be disregarded in determining whether a condition of specific or subspecific homonymy exists; (7) the deletion from the third paragraph of Article 35 of the words "of the same origin and meaning", experience having shown that those words (the interpretation of which required a specialised knowledge

For a later decision on the question here discussed, see Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Minute 6)

of the origin of words in Latin and other languages not possessed by the majority of zoologists) served to make the provision in question virtually unworkable. The Commission recommended also, though with some hesitation, that the rules applying to specific and subspecific homonymy should apply to cases where a condition of apparent specific or subspecific homonymy arose not as between two species placed in a single genus but as between species placed in different genera, which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bore the same name.

In the course of their discussion of the foregoing problem, the Commission had agreed upon certain other recommendations which they desired to submit to the Section and the Congress. These recommendations were concerned to secure: (1) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging authors to secure publicity for new family and sub-family names, for new specific and subspecific names, and for the names of new infra-subspecific forms, for the elevation of names given to infra-subspecific forms to be the trivial names of subspecies or species and also for the selection of the type species of genera (under Article 30), by communicating copies of papers containing such new names or such type selections to a literature-recording serial such as the " Zoological Record "; (2) the insertion of a provision requiring that, in order to come within the scope of Article 25, every new specific or subspecific name must be published in connection with a generic name; (3) the co-ordination of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34-36); (4) the application to Article 34 (relating to generic homonymy) of the amendment recommended to be made in the third paragraph of Article 35 (relating to specific homonymy), *i.e.* the recommendation in favour of the deletion of the words " of the same origin and meaning ".

The Commission considered that it was too much to hope that any single revision of the Law of Homonymy could be completely satisfactory and they fully expected that, if their present recommendations were approved, experience in the operation of the new provisions would suggest directions in which further improvements could be effected. Nevertheless, the present scheme represented, in the opinion of the Commission, an immense improvement upon the totally inadequate provisions of the present Articles 35 and 36. The Commission therefore commended the present scheme to the favourable consideration of the Section and the Congress.

Codification of the interpretations of the "Règles" given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in "Opinions" and of the resolutions incorporated in the Commission's "Declarations"

(d) The fourth matter concerned the reform of the *Règles* on which the Commission desired to submit recommendations to the Section, and the Congress was concerned with the incorporation in the *Règles* (a) of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the Commission at different times in *Opinions* rendered in their judicial capacity and (b) of the substance of a number of important resolutions adopted by the Commission or the Congress on different occasions and subsequently incorporated by the Commission in *Declarations*. The nature of the recommendations now submitted would be found in Commission Papers **I.C.(48)10, 11** and **13.**

The Articles in the *Règles* into which additional provisions would be inserted on the acceptance of the proposed codification were Article 4 (*Opinion* 141), Article 8 (*Opinion* 183), Article 14 (*Opinion* 64), Article 19 (*Opinions* 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 63, 69), Article 25 (*Opinions* 1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 49, 52, 59, 87, 88, 145, 191), Article 26 (*Opinion* 3), Article 30 (*Opinions* 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18, 35, 46, 47, 62, 65, 88, 148, 164, 168, 172), Article 34 (*Opinions* 25, 102, 125, 145, 147, 148), Article 35 (*Opinions* 102, 145, 148). Full particulars of the nature and extent of the codification proposed in respect of the interpretation of these Articles in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission would be found in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11.** In the course of the examination of the recommendations put forward in that paper, the Commission had come to the conclusion that in two cases the existing provisions in the *Règles* were unsatisfactory and required amendment. The Articles concerned were Articles 4 and 5 relating to the formation of the names of families and sub-families, and Article 19 relating to the emendation of names where those names were mis-spelt on being first published. In each case the issues involved were complex and required much more detailed consideration than had as yet been given to them. Following the precedent set at the Lisbon Congress in 1935 in connection with the nomenclature of forms of less than specific rank, the Commission had invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a detailed study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the issues involved in each of these problems, and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at the next meeting of the Congress. The Commission had agreed that, on the acceptance of the proposals now submitted, (a) the *Opinions* containing the interpretations now codified, in whole or in part, and (b) in the case of *Opinions* which contained both interpretations of the *Règles* and also decisions relating to particular names, the interpretative portions of the *Opinions* concerned should be repealed for interpretative purposes. The *Opinions* falling in the first

of these classes were *Opinions* 1–7, 10, 35, 46, 62, 64, 65, 87, 141, 145, 147, 148, 164, 168, 172, 183, 191. The *Opinions* falling in the second of the foregoing classes were *Opinions* 14, 16, 18, 25–27, 29, 36, 41, 43, 47, 49, 52, 59–61, 63, 88, 102, 125.

The Commission believed that the recommendations now submitted covered all the interpretative *Opinions* so far rendered, but if any zoologist considered that an interpretation of a provision in the *Règles* had been given in any *Opinion* other than those specified above, the Commission would be glad to be furnished with particulars so that they might consider the matter before the next meeting of the Congress. The view of the Commission was that every interpretation of the *Règles* given in an *Opinion* already published should either be incorporated in the *Règles* or be withdrawn and that the *Opinion* in question should be repealed or cancelled immediately a decision was taken in one or other of the foregoing senses. As regards the future, the Commission proposed that the series of *Declarations* should be reserved for interpretations of provisions of the *Règles*, that such interpretations should become effective immediately upon publication, and that every *Declaration* so rendered should in addition contain a proposal for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision giving effect to the interpretation there given. The Commission further proposed that every such *Declaration* rendered during an inter-Congress period should be brought to the attention of the Congress at its next meeting with a recommendation that the proposal set forth therein be approved and adopted. These proposals would be found set out in detail in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)10.**

Turning to the *Declarations* already rendered by the Commission, the Section would find that they had already agreed to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of one (*Declaration* 5), which recorded the grant to the Commission of plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain circumstances and that two others (*Declarations* 9 and 10) dealt with subjects which, though of great importance, were not suitable for incorporation in the *Règles*. As would be seen from Commission Paper **I.C.(48)13,** the Commission proposed that the substance of the remaining *Declarations* (namely, *Declarations* 1–4, 6–8, 11 and 12) should now be incorporated in the *Règles* and, with *Declaration* 5, thereupon be repealed. The Commission recommended also the insertion in the *Règles* of *Recommandations* urging authors publishing new names for any taxonomic category clearly to indicate that the name was new and to cite that name in a specified manner.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the "Règles"

(e) The fifth of the items to be considered consisted of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in various respects. Most of these proposals were designed to supply the answers to questions not at present dealt with in the *Règles* or to remove ambiguities in the wording of existing provisions. The bulk of these proposals were explained in detail in Commission Papers **I.C.(48)12, I.C.(48)14,** and **I.C.(48)15,** but in addition a certain number of similar recommendations had been agreed upon by the Commission in the course of their discussion of Commission Papers **I.C.(48)6** and **I.C.(48)11.** He (the President) proposed to deal in turn with the recommendations falling in each of these groups.

Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Commission Paper I.C. (48) 6

In the course of their consideration of Paper **I.C.(48)6,** the Commission had agreed to submit recommendations designed : (1) to make it clear that names published in contravention of Articles 11–16, 18 and 20 were automatically to be corrected by later authors so as to make them comply with the requirements of the foregoing Articles, Article 19 not being concerned with corrections falling within these classes, and that names corrected to comply with Articles 11–16, 18 and 20 and names emended under Article 19 rank for purposes of priority from their original date of publication and are to be attributed to their original author, it being at the same time agreed that the Commission's *Opinion* 8 (the interpretation in which was incorrect) should be cancelled ; (2) to eliminate the ritualistic provisions involved in the use in Article 25 of the expressions " definite bibliographic reference," and " definite unambiguous designation of the type species " and the requirement that all descriptions of new systematic units must contain comparisons with previously described units, but at the same time to indicate by means of *Recommandations* inserted in Article 25 the ideal method to be followed by authors in these matters, it being agreed at the same time that the Commission's *Opinion* 138 (which would thus cease to be applicable) should be cancelled ; (3) to make it clear that the provisions in the Second Schedule (hitherto known as the *Appendice*) were not mandatory in character ; (4) to redraft Article 31 to make it clear that it referred to nomenclature and not to taxonomy and, by eliminating the reference to Article 30, to give clear directions as to the action to be taken to determine the identity of a composite nominal species : (5) to insert a reference to the category " subgenus " in Article 2, from which it had inadvertently been omitted ; (6) to redraft the *Recommandation* to Article 29 and to transfer it to Article 25.

Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C. (48) 11

The discussion on Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11** had given rise to the following recommendations; (1) to make it clear that, where a new specific trivial name was published in a list of species or subspecies and was there preceded by a serial letter or numeral, that serial letter or numeral was not to be taken as constituting part of the specific trivial name in question; (2) to make it clear both as regards generic names and as regards specific and subspecific trivial names that the list of differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether a given name was a homonym of another name specified, in the first case, in Article 34 and, in the second case, in Article 35 was in each case an exhaustive list and that in consequence a name which differed from another name in spelling in any other way was not to be rejected as a homonym of that name; (3) to make it clear in the third paragraph of Article 35 that, where a specific or subspecific trivial name was an adjective and differed from another such trivial name only in termination and that difference was due to a difference in the gender in which the adjective was cited, the two trivial names were to be treated as homonyms of one another; (4) to insert in the *Règles Recommandations* urging authors (i) not to select as generic names words already used as names of orders or higher categories and (ii) not to publish names conditionally.

Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C.(48)12

Commission Paper **I.C.(48)12** contained twenty recommendations for the amendment of the *Règles*. These were concerned with: (1) the insertion in Article 8 of a *Recommandation* urging the selection of short and euphonious words as generic names; (2) the redrafting of Article 13 to eliminate the existing option to use a capital initial letter in citing certain specific and subspecific trivial names; (3) the insertion of a provision in Article 14 containing a *Recommandation* in relation to specific and subspecific trivial names similar to that proposed in (1) above in relation to generic names; (4) the substitution of examples drawn from binominal authors for examples drawn from non-binominal authors, wherever such occurred in the *Règles*; (5) the deletion of the existing *Recommandation* in Article 22 and the insertion of a new *Recommandation* deprecating the abbreviation of the names of authors, except in certain specified cases; (6) the insertion in Article 25 of words to secure that apparent new names (generic or trivial) or new combinations due to errors in literature-recording serials should have no status in nomenclature; (7) the clarification of the meaning of the expression "les principes de la

nomenclature binominale " as used in the amended text of Article 25 already agreed upon by the Section; (8) the restriction of certain portions of Article 30 to names published before 1st January, 1931; (9) various verbal amendments in Article 30 to make it clear that that Article was concerned not with taxonomy but with nomenclature; (10) amendments in the same and other Articles to correct errors due to imperfect drafting; (11) the clarification of Rule (*g*) in Article 30; (12) the clarification of the meaning of Article 31; (13) the insertion in Article 35 of a provision applying to trivial names the provisions already recommended to be inserted in Article 34 in relation to generic names by the incorporation therein of the interpretation given in the Commission's *Opinion* 148; (14) the introduction of a provision recognising and defining the expressions " holotype," " syntype," and " lectotype," of *Recommandations* regarding the description and marking of types and their deposit in public institutions where their safe preservation could be reasonably assured, the avoidance of the expression co-type, the insertion of a declaratory Article declaring that types are the property of Science, and the deletion of the provisions relating to types in the *Appendice*; (15) the introduction of a provision prescribing the trivial name to be applied to the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more named subspecies; (16) the problem of neotypes; (17) the insertion of a provision to prevent the misuse of the *Règles* for the purpose of giving political, religious or personal offence; (18) to (20) proposals designed to remove unnecessary obscurities, verbal inconsistencies and meaningless repetitions from the *Règles*. In the case of the question whether the category " neotype " should be recognised in the *Règles*, the Commission considered that further examination in conjunction with specialists was desirable and they had invited the Secretary to the Commission to undertake such an inquiry and to submit a Report, with recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress. The Commission recommended the adoption of the recommendations submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)12**, subject only to certain minor modifications. In the course of their consideration of this paper, the Commission had agreed also to recommend that, throughout the *Règles*, the expressions " nominal genus " and " nominal species " should be substituted for the expressions " genus " and " species," wherever the provision in question referred not to a genus or to a species in the taxonomic sense but to the concept represented by a given generic name or specific name, as the case might be.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Minute* 6)

Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C.(48)14

The next group of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* were those dealt with in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)14.** The twelve proposals in this paper were numbered consecutively with those in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)12.** The field covered by these proposals included :—(21) the addition of words to Article 8 to provide for the case where a new generic name consisting of a Latinised word of another language was published as though it was a noun in the nominative singular, whereas in its original language it was in some number or case other than the singular or the nominative ; (22) the addition to Article 14 of a *Recommandation* urging authors not to select as trivial names words already in use in allied groups; (23) the deletion from Article 15 of the permissive provisions in regard to the use of hyphens, subject to certain exceptions, and the clarification of that Article in certain respects ; (24) the insertion in Article 18 of four amendments designed to clarify the meaning ; (25) the insertion of a provision regulating the status of names published anonymously or over initials only ; (26) the clarification of the meaning of the expression " divulgué dans une publication " as used in Article 25, the insertion of a *Recommandation* in regard thereto, and the repeal of *Opinions* 15 and 51 for interpretative purposes ; (27) the clarification of the status of names first published in abstracts ; (28) the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* regarding the publication of new names in a work consisting of keys ; (29) the criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given work and the method of citing such dates ; (30) the priority to be accorded to new names when published in a work appearing in parts where a portion of the description was included at the end of one part and the remainder in the beginning of the next part ; (31) the status of trivial names published after 31st December, 1930, in binominal combinations in which the generic names used did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 ; (32) the proposed addition to the Second Schedule (formerly the *Appendice*) of a section indicating the manner in which names derived from words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet. The Commission had approved the recommendations submitted on the above matters, subject only to minor amendments and accordingly now commended them to the Section and the Congress for approval. When considering this paper the Commission had considered also certain proposals for the clarification of Article 14 submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet. These proposals, which had as their object the validation of current practice, were commended by the Commission to the favourable consideration of the Section. Certain

other somewhat similar proposals, of which the most important related to the formation of compound trivial names, also submitted by Professor Bonnet, had been deferred for further consideration after the close of the Congress. In addition, while examining the proposals in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)14,** the Commission had decided to submit two further recommendations, of which the first was concerned with certain minor amplifications in Article 15, while the second related to the orthography of names, the first portion of which consisted of a numeral.

Recommendations arising out of the consideration of Paper I.C.(48)15

The last group of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* which the Commission wished to submit to the Section at its present meeting were those dealt with in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)15.** These proposals, thirty-one in number, were numbered consecutively with those in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)14,** and appeared therefore as proposals (33) to (63). The subjects dealt with in these proposals were :—(33) the need for the adaptation of Article 27 to meet the nomenclatorial requirements of polymorphic Protozoa ; (34) the status of certain very similar names for the purpose of Article 35 ; (35) the position where under Article 4 two families had identical names ; (36) the procedure to be followed on the union on taxonomic grounds of two families ; (37) the need for defining the expression Latin in Article 3 and for removing ambiguities from Article 5 arising from the ill-advised use of the technical expression " radical " ; (38) the method to be followed to secure the agreement of adjectival trivial names in gender with the generic names with which they were combined ; (39) the insertion in a Schedule of a section on the gender of Latin nouns and of Greek nouns Latinised on being used as generic names and on the differences in the terminations of the nominative singular of adjectives according to the gender used (as a guide in the citation of adjectival trivial names) ; (40) the point of time as from which the Proviso (c) added to Article 25 at Budapest became operative ; (41) the insertion of a correction in paragraph 16 in Section " G " of the Second Schedule ; (42) the status of trivial names consisting of unchanged modern patronymics ; (43) the status of trivial names consisting of arbitrary combinations of letters and consolidation into Article 8 of the present *Recommandations* ; (44) the use of parentheses (in English usually called " round brackets ") where subgeneric names are used as well as generic names ; (45) the question whether a description of the work of an animal constitutes an " indication " ; (46) the status of generic names based

upon figures only ; (47) the authorship and date for priority of names published conditionally ; (48) the question whether the citation of a host species without any other descriptive matter constitutes an " indication " for a parasitic species and parallel problem where, in the case of a fossil species, only the geological horizon is cited ; (49) the meaning of the expression " le plus anciennement designé " as used in Article 25 ; (50) the action to be taken on proposals submitted for the deletion of Articles 22 and 23 of the *Règles* ; (51) the authorship of a name which, when first validly published, was already a manuscript name or a *nomen nudum* ; (52) the clarification of Rule (g) in Article 30 ; (53) the title of the *Règles* as now proposed to be amended ; (54) the establishment of Schedules for recording decisions taken regarding the availability of individual names or classes of name ; (55) the use of names ending in " -idae " or " -inae " for purposes other than that of the names for families or subfamilies ; (56) and (57) the need for drafting amendments in Articles 12 and 7 ; (58) the co-ordination of the wording used in Articles 6 and 11 ; (59) the elimination of an illogicality and of an error in Section (b) of the second *Recommandation* to Article 8 ; (60) the conversion into a mandatory provision of the decision taken at Padua in 1930 which at present appears quite inappropriately as a *Recommandation* to Article 36 ; (61) the extension to all works by Linnaeus and Fabricius (J.C.) of the interpretation of Article 25 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 124 ; (62) the status of names placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ; (63) the establishment for the trivial names of species of an " Official List " similar to that already established for generic names. The Commission had adopted recommendations on the basis of the foregoing proposals and now submitted these for the approval of the Section. During their discussion of these proposals the Commission had agreed also to recommend (1) the co-ordination of Article 1 and Articles 34 and 35 and the co-ordination also of Articles 19 and 32 and (2) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging the avoidance of the publication of a name differing from a previously published name only through having, as its stressed syllable, the syllable " an " or " en ", as the case may be ; (3) the insertion of a *Recommandation* condemning the publication of names suggesting a bizarre or otherwise objectionable meaning in some language other than Latin ; (4) the insertion of a provision that the citation of a geological horizon on the first publication of a name for a fossil species does not constitute an " indication " ; (5) the allocation to Articles 34 and 35 of the *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 36. Finally, the Commission had invited the

Secretary to prepare a review of the problem created by the provisions in Article 28 in relation to the "first reviser" and they hoped to be able to submit proposals thereon to the Section before the end of the present Congress. Of the proposals now submitted, those numbered (62) and (63), the Section would observe, went a little way in the direction of securing the greater stability in nomenclature advocated by the Section at its previous meeting. Further than this the Commission did not consider it desirable to go during the present Congress, although they recognised that it was the general wish of the members of the Section that this matter should be treated in a bolder and more comprehensive fashion. For the reasons explained at the meeting held on the previous day, the Commission thought it wise to provide an opportunity for the discussion of this problem before they proceeded further, for, as he (the President) had reminded the Section, there were zoologists not present at the Congress who were such firm believers in the efficacy of the Law of Priority that they were opposed to any concrete action being taken in other ways to promote stability in nomenclature.

Continuing, THE PRESIDENT said that the statement which he had just made placed the Section and, through the Section, the Congress in full possession of the conclusions reached and the recommendations agreed upon by the Commission during its present Session up to the end of its meeting held on the previous evening. The Commission invited the Section to approve its proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in the directions which he had indicated and its recommendations as to the procedure to be adopted for preparing a text of the *Règles* revised in accordance with the decisions taken by the present Congress, for the checking of the text so prepared, for its promulgation as soon as possible after having been so checked, and for its immediate entry into force upon being so promulgated. The statement presented to the Section was inevitably condensed in form but the fact that it had been based on a series of papers, copies of which had been distributed, had, he felt confident, made it easy for the members of the Section to follow the proposals submitted by the Commission. Moreover, the majority of those attending the present meeting of the Section had attended some or all of the public meetings of the Commission at which those proposals had been drawn up. If, however, any member of the Section desired to be furnished with additional information on any of the proposals in question or to ask any questions in regard thereto, he (the President) would be very pleased to comply with a request so made.

After a motion had been proposed and seconded that the Section adopt a Resolution in the sense suggested by the President and after an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section to ask any question or to bring forward an amendment to the foregoing proposal, and no such amendment had been submitted, THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) put the motion to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : date and time appointed

14. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had originally expected that it would be necessary to ask the Section to meet again that afternoon and perhaps also that evening. The discussion that had taken place both on the previous day and again at this morning's meeting had, however, been conducted by all concerned in so co-operative a spirit and with such a close attention to business that it would not be necessary for him to ask either the Section or the Commission to meet again before the week-end. The next meeting of the Section, which would be held concurrently with a meeting of the Commission, would be held at the same place on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 09.00 hours. At that meeting the draft of the Report to be submitted to the Congress would be laid before the Commission and the Section.

(*The Section thereupon adjourned at* 12.10 *hours*)

APPENDIX TO THE MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE, THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE ZOOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA

(a) Copy of a communication addressed by the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna and other Austrian Zoologists to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948

(handed to the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the opening day of the Congress)

An den

Internationalen Kongress für Zoologie,

Paris.

Die österreichische Zoologenschaft erlaubt sich an den Kongress das folgende Ansuchen zu stellen :

Es ist eine von jedem Zoologen bitter empfundene Tatsache, dass sich die zoologische Nomenklatur der Gegenwart in einem Zustand bedauerlicher Unsicherheit und Verwirrung befindet. Immer wieder werden jahrhundertlang in einheitlichem Gebrauch gewesene Namen verworfen und durch unbekannte andere ersetzt, nicht aus sachlich systematisch-klassifikatorischen Gründen, sondern lediglich um einer leeren Schablonenforderung nach absoluter Priorität Genüge zu tun. In der ganzen Welt ist eine Gegenbewegung gegen diese stetige und völlig unnötige Bedrohung der Kontinuität der wissenschaftlichen Tierbenennung im Zuge ; eine grundlegende Reform der Nomenklaturregeln ist unbedingt erforderlich. Eine solche Reform bedarf jedoch der wohlvorbereiteten Mitarbeit und Zustimmung der gesamten Zoologenschaft der Erde. Keinesfalls darf sie überstürzt und einseitig nach dem Willen Einzelner durchgeführt werden, die sich in einer ohne diese Vorbereitungen zusammengestellten Kommission im Augenblicke in der Mehrheit befinden könnten.

Die wirklich den Willen der Zoologenschaft der Erde zum Ausdruck bringende Zusammenarbeit ist aber infolge der besonderen Verhältnisse der Nachkriegszeit gegenwärtig nicht erreichbar. Die Kriegshandlungen der jüngst verflossenen Zeitperiode haben den Verkehr der Zoologen der einzelnen Länder unterbunden ; eine gegenseitige Verständigung über die Wünsche und Bedürfnisse der Gesamtheit war nicht möglich. Deshalb ist auch die Aufstellung einer Nomenklaturkommission, die das Mandat der Gesamtheit besitzt, zur Zeit nicht möglich. Da ausserdem manche Länder infolge der Nachkriegsnot nicht

imstande sind, eine zureichende Vertretung zu diesem ersten Kongress nach Kriegsende zu entsenden, besteht für diesen Kongress die ernste Gefahr einer nicht hinreichend vorbereiteten, voreiligen Beschlussfassung in nomenklatorischen Dingen, die in ihren weittragenden Folgen nicht nur die gesamte Zoologie, sondern auch alle mit Tiernamen irgendwie in Beziehung tretenden Wissensgebiete betreffen. Um einer solchen folgenschweren, voreiligen Beschlussfassung vorzubeugen, erlaubt sich die österreichische Zoologenschaft zunächst als Richtlinie den folgenden Grundsatz aufzustellen :

Jeder heute einheitlich gebrauchte, eingelebte wissenschaftliche Tiername ist ein unschätzbarer nomenklatorischer Wert, ein Verständigungsmittel, dessen Zerstörung den Zoologiebetrieb schwer schädigt. Bis zur endgültigen Regelung der Verhältnisse ist daher jede Aenderung eines einheitlich gebrauchten Namens zu unterlassen, wenn für die Aenderung nur formal-nomenklatorische (Prioritäts-) Gründe, aber keine systematischen Notwendigkeiten vorliegen.

Im Sinne dieses Grundsatzes wird der Kongress gebeten, dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass *auf diesem Kongresse keine Beschlüsse gefasst werden, die die Nomenklaturregeln betreffen*, und dass uberhaupt nichts veranlasst werde, was dem obzitierten Grundsatz widerspricht und was geeignet wäre, eine weitere Verwirrung der nomenklatorischen Verhältnisse in der Zoologie zu bewirken. Die für eine gesunde Zukunft der zoologischen Nomenklatur unerlässlichen Reformbeschlüsse sollen *späteren Kongressen vorbehalten* bleiben, bei denen die wohlerwogenen berechtigten Wünsche der Zoologenschaft der Erde vollständiger und klarer zum ausdruck kommen können als dies auf diesem Kongress möglich wäre.

Prof. OTTO STORCH

Zoologisches Institut der Universität Wien.

Vorstand des Zoologischen Institutes der Universität Wien, korr. Mitglied der österr. Akademie der Wissenschaft.

Dr. KARL HOLDHAUS

Naturhistorisches Museums Wien. Zoologische Abteilung.

Direktor Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien.

U. STUNDRAL

Zoologisch-Botanische Gesellschaft.

Generalsekretär der Zoologisch-Botanischen Gesellschaft in Wien.

(b) Copy of letter (Z.N.(G.)36), dated 29th July, 1948, from the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, to the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna

Sehr geehrter Herr Professor !

I have the honour to inform you that the communication on the subject of zoological nomenclature addressed to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology jointly by yourself, by the Director of the Naturhistorische Museum in Vienna and by the Secretary-General of the Zoologisch-Botanischen Gesellschaft

of Vienna was duly communicated to me as President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress. On receiving your communication I at once placed it before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

The Section on Nomenclature was in complete agreement with the convictions expressed in your communication of the urgent need for securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature and of avoiding, as far as possible, changes in established names undertaken for purely nomenclatorial reasons. This view was fully shared also by the International Commission. Both the Commission and the Section were in full accord with you and your colleagues that a fundamental reform of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* was necessary for this end.

Indeed, in response both to their own convictions and also to the widely-expressed views along these lines received from zoologists in all parts of the world, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had itself carefully prepared and formulated proposals for the consideration of the Congress for the amendment of the *Règles* with a view to securing uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.

While the Section on Nomenclature and the International Commission unanimously regretted that circumstances made it impossible for zoologists of certain countries to be present at the Congress which has just closed and to participate in its work, it was felt that the need for proceeding in the direction of greater stability was so urgent and the proposals submitted by the Commission for meeting this need commanded such general support that no further delay in undertaking the necessary and long-overdue reforms in the *Règles* would be justified.

Accordingly, the Congress agreed upon a number of amendments of the *Règles* designed to remove obscurities, to offer guidance on certain important matters not hitherto covered by the *Règles* and generally to bring the *Règles* into greater harmony with the practice and wishes of the general body of zoologists. The Congress further agreed to a general codification of the law in regard to zoological nomenclature through the incorporation into the *Règles* themselves of interpretations of particular Articles given in the past by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature acting in its judicial capacity, and the inclusion in Schedules to be attached to the *Règles* of decisions taken by the Commission in individual cases.

Two important amendments were adopted which should go far towards procuring stability in nomenclature and which should therefore be particularly welcome to you and your colleagues in Austria. First, it was agreed that no name inserted in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" should be discarded by zoologists on purely nomenclatorial grounds without the prior approval of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Second, it was agreed to establish an "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" with similar standing. The enhanced status of names placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the establishment of the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" would, it was thought, encourage

specialists to assemble all the important generic names and specific trivial names in the groups in which they are interested and to assure stability for them by these means.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress feel confident that Austrian zoologists will welcome these changes, as also the other changes in the *Règles* which have been adopted at the meeting which has just closed. I am writing this letter in Paris on the eve of my return to London and it is my intention to forward to you for your information and that of your colleagues as soon as possible a set of the documents submitted to the Congress, which formed the basis of the reforms which have been agreed upon. Further, these documents, together with the detailed record of the decisions taken by the Commission and the Congress, will be published as soon as possible by the Commission in their *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.*

Other important reforms agreed upon during the Congress, on the recommendation of the Commission, were concerned to secure a more truly representative character to the Commission and to reform its procedure in order to enable decisions to be taken with greater rapidity. Under the first of these heads, it will be possible now to secure that zoologists in any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work is being done may be directly represented on the Commission, while, under the second of these heads, the Congress have approved a proposal abolishing the obsolete and undesirable *Liberum Veto* which in the past has constituted an unnecessary obstacle in the way of reform of the *Règles.*

It is the earnest hope and the confident belief of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that these reforms will be warmly welcomed by the zoologists of Austria. The Commission look forward also with pleasure to the early resumption of close and friendly co-operation between themselves and the zoologists of Austria. In particular, the Commission trust that at the next meeting of the International Congress of Zoology, to be held at Copenhagen in 1953, the zoologists of Austria and other countries not represented at the Congress which has just closed will be able to be present and thus be able once more to take the active part which they have always played in the Section on Nomenclature in promoting the development of zoological nomenclature on sound and progressive lines.

Hochachtungsvoll,

FRANCIS HEMMING

President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Third Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 09.30 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Eleventh Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)
Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Apology by the President for late arrival

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) apologised for having kept the meeting waiting. The reason, as the Section appreciated, was that, although ever since the close of the meeting on Saturday he had been engaged continuously on work in connection with to-day's meetings of the Section and the Commission, he had only just completed the preparation of the necessary documents.

Programme for the Meetings to be held during Monday, 26th July, 1948

2. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) outlined the procedure which he proposed for the meetings to be held that day. Excellent progress had been made by the Section—as also by the International Commission—during the meetings held during the previous week. Nevertheless, there remained a large amount of work which it was essential should be dealt with during the limited time available before the close of the Congress. In the first place there was still a considerable number of proposals for the improvement of the *Règles* which would need to be considered first by the Commission and second by the Section to whom the recommendations of the Commission would be submitted for approval. Second, there were many proposals relating to individual problems of nomenclature which had been submitted to the Commission and on which it was most important that decisions should be taken during the present Session. This was important for two reasons: first, because many of the applicants concerned had expressed the liveliest hope that the present opportunity would not be missed for securing decisions on the cases which they had submitted, in some cases—owing to the war and other causes—a considerable number of years ago; second, it was important that the Commission should reach decisions on these cases in order to demonstrate to zoologists generally that they were capable of taking prompt action on cases which had been carefully prepared and properly submitted. In order to achieve this two-fold programme, it would be necessary for the Section and the Commission to devote to the purpose the whole of the present day and in addition probably to meet again in the evening after dinner. He (the President) did not doubt that members of the Section, as of the Commission, would gladly rise to their responsibilities in this matter.

Continuing, the President said that he proposed that all the meetings to be held during the course of the day should be concurrent meetings both of the Commission and of the Section. This procedure would enable the Commission to reach conclusions on the matters awaiting their attention in the presence of the members of the Section and, as he hoped, with the assistance and advice of any members of the Section who might desire to take part in these discussions. Under this procedure, recommendations adopted by the Commission should, he suggested, at once be reported to the Section for approval.

THE SECTION took note of the programme outlined by the President and approved the proposals which he had submitted in regard to the procedure to be adopted.

Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he was pleased to be able to inform the Section that Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had consented to act as an Alternate Member of the Commission during the remainder of its meetings during the present Session, *vice* Professor B. Hankó (Hungary).

THE SECTION took note of the statement just made by the President.

Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche as the Danish Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

4. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had to report that, much to the regret of the Commission, Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) had intimated that on reflection he felt that pressure of his other duties, especially duties in connection with the next meeting of the Congress, would make it preferable that some other Danish zoologist should be nominated to be the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen, whose resignation, on grounds of ill-health, had already been reported. Discussions on this question had accordingly been held between the Danish zoologists present at the Congress, who had recommended that the vacancy in the Commission so created should be filled by the election of Dr. Henning Lemche. This recommendation had been gladly accepted by the Commission, to whom Dr. Lemche was well known both as a correspondent and because of his active participation in the work of the Commission during its public meetings held during the present Session. The Commission felt confident that this nomination would be agreeable to the Section, to whom also Dr. Lemche was well known through the contributions to their discussions which he had made at their previous meetings. It was proposed also that Dr. Lemche should act as an Alternate Member of the Commission *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the election of Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) to be a Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as from the close of the present Congress in succession to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) in place of Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) who had previously been nominated as Dr. Mortensen's successor but who now asked to be excused from service on the Commission in view of great pressure of other work. The Section took note also that Dr. Lemche had been elected to be an Alternate Member of the Commission in place of Professor J. R. Dymond for the duration of the present Congress.

Report to the Congress submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in accordance with custom the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would need to submit a Report on their work during their present Session for submission to the Congress. It had been ascertained that at the present, as at previous meetings of the Congress, the proceedings on the Reports of the Section and the Commission to be made at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning would be purely formal, the entire recommendations of the Section and the Commission being put to the Congress *en bloc*, no discussion on individual points being permitted. In these circumstances and because of the extreme difficulties under which within a very few hours the Secretary to the Commission had had to prepare the draft of the Report of the Commission, it had been considered preferable to concentrate in that document upon drawing attention to the major reforms in the *Règles* and in the composition and procedure of the Commission which were recommended, while referring only in general terms to the large number of minor improvements which it was proposed should be introduced into the *Règles* when a revised text was prepared to give effect to the decisions reached by the Section on Nomenclature. This was a commonsense arrangement which he (the President) was confident would commend itself to the Commission and the Section and secure their approval, it being known already that it met with the approval of the authorities of the Congress.

Continuing, the President said that, although the number of copies of the draft of the Commission's Report (Commission Paper **I.C.(48)20**) was limited, there were sufficient copies to enable every member of the Section, by sharing copies with one another, to study the text of the Report before it was discussed by the Section. At former meetings of the Congress the Commission's Report had not been considered by the Section prior to its being approved by the Commission, and, even when it had been so approved, no copies had been provided for the Section who had had to rely upon listening to the Report being read aloud by the Secretary to the Commission. That procedure made it difficult to obtain a proper understanding of the terms of the Report, particularly for those members of the Section whose mother tongue was some language other than English. The Commission felt sure that the Section would welcome the innovation constituted by the presentation of the Report, while still in the draft stage, and the circulation of typed copies. The President proposed that the Section should adjourn for a short time to enable

members to examine the draft of the Report proposed to be submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

THE SECTION accordingly adjourned for the purpose suggested by the President.

(*On resumption*)

THE SECTION examined paragraph by paragraph the draft of the Report prepared for submission by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for submission to the Congress (Paper **I.C.(48)20**). In the course of the discussion the following points were made :—

(1) *Paragraph* 17: In view of the statement just made to the Section regarding the change in the Danish representation on the Commission, a drafting change would need to be made in this paragraph. It was explained that this paragraph had been prepared before the change referred to had become known.

(2) *Paragraph* 19: It was pointed out that a corresponding change in this paragraph was required. It would be necessary also to recast this paragraph, in order to explain the system for securing the periodical renewal of the membership of the Commission which the Section had agreed to substitute for the system of nine-year Classes, which had outworn its usefulness when the Congress ceased to meet regularly at three-yearly intervals.

(3) *Paragraphs* 32–35 : The view was expressed that the situation disclosed by these paragraphs was very disturbing. The grant made to the Commission by UNESCO was of great value, but it was evident that none the less the continued existence of the Commission as an effective working organisation depended exclusively upon the efforts of the spare-time honorary Secretary. This was clearly most unsatisfactory, for it was quite wrong that an essential piece of international machinery should rest upon so precarious a foundation. Every possible effort should be made to secure a satisfactory financial basis for the Commission.

(4) *Paragraphs* 44 and 45 : It was suggested that these two paragraphs, of which the first was concerned with the " Official List " for generic names and the second with the corresponding List for the names of species, should be drafted in similar terms, paragraph 45 being redrafted on the lines of paragraph 44.

It was desirable to indicate the types of names proposed to be placed on the new "Official List" and also to emphasise that the names standardised in that "Official List" were specific trivial names and that, while it was essential to cite in connection with each of the trivial names concerned the generic name in combination with which it had originally been published, the fact that the specific trivial name was standardised by being placed on the "Official List" did not confer any status on the binominal combination in which that specific trivial name had originally been published or imply any view on the taxonomic question of the genus to which the species should be referred. This point might be made clear if the title given to this "Official List" referred not to "specific names" (i.e. to binominal combinations) but to "specific trivial names". It was generally agreed that it was desirable that this change should be made and also that the explanation of the scope of this "Official List" which had just been given should be recorded in the Commission's Report, together with a recommendation that a statement explaining the position in this regard should be prefixed to this "Official List" when it was published.

(5) *Paragraph* 47 : It was suggested that it was worth giving further consideration to the proposals set forth in the last two sentences of this paragraph. As there drafted, those sentences correctly reflected the decision already taken by the Section, but it should be realised that the responsibility for checking the draft of the revised *Règles*, when prepared by the jurists, was a heavy one, demanding not only the greatest care but also a thorough knowledge of the decisions taken by the present Congress and of the discussions leading up to those decisions. In the special circumstances created by the absence from the present Congress of two of the members of the Executive Committee, it was for consideration whether it would not be better to entrust this duty to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee composed of members (including, if desired, Alternate Members) of the Commission who had been present at the Paris Congress and had taken an active part in the discussions of the Commission and the Section. The President recalled that this was the Proposal which, as Secretary to the Commission, he had himself submitted to the Commission (Paper

I.C.(48)6, paragraph 26(iii)). This proposal, which followed the precedent set by the Berlin Congress of 1901 when the present *Règles* were approved, had the advantage that it ensured that the personnel of the Editorial Committee was fully acquainted with all the details of the Paris discussions; it had the further advantage that it did not throw, as did the existing proposal, an undue burden upon those members of the Executive Committee who had not been present at the Paris Congress. For these reasons he (the President) welcomed the amendment of this paragraph of the Report which had been suggested from the floor of the Section.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was clear from the discussion which had taken place that the Commission were in general agreement with the draft Report which had been submitted to them (Paper **I.C.(48)20**) and also that there was general agreement in the Section on that Report, subject to the modifications and corrections which had been suggested. In order to make progress with this matter, it was necessary now that the Commission itself should formally adopt the Report as a preliminary to its being put by him to the Section for approval. He accordingly proposed that the Section should adjourn for a short time to enable the Commission to consider the draft Report in the light of the discussion.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider the draft of their Report to the Congress in the light of the suggestions made in the discussion which had just taken place.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had unanimously adopted as their Report to the Congress the draft attached to Paper **I.C.(48)20,** subject to the incorporation therein of the corrections in paragraphs 17 and 19 rendered necessary by the proposed change in the Danish representation on the Commission and by the introduction of a new system in place of the three nine-year Classes into which the Commission was at present divided, and to the redrafting of paragraph 45 in accordance with the suggestions made in the course of the discussion in the Section. In the case also of paragraph 47, the Commission were in agreement with the views expressed in the Section and had agreed to modify that paragraph in the sense suggested. The Commission proposed to consider later in

the day the exact terms to be adopted for this paragraph, if that course were agreeable to the Section. He (the President) therefore now submitted the Report of the Commission to the Section for approval. In doing so he had to recall that, as he had explained earlier during the present meeting, there still remained a considerable number of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* to be considered, first by the Commission and, second, by the Section. In the form in which the Report was drafted, it would cover those proposals if later in the day the Commission and the Section were to agree upon them. No change would therefore need to be made on account of these proposals. It would be necessary however for the Section to secure that the approval of the minor amendments to the *Règles* referred to in the Commission's Report signified by them (the Section) when approving the Commission's Report extended not only to such of those amendments as had already been approved (i.e. all those amendments approved by the Section up to the end of their meeting held on the previous Saturday) but also to such similar amendments as might be approved by the Section in the course of the present day. The Section had had a most instructive and valuable discussion on the Commission's Report, and it would, he (the President) believed, be to the general advantage if the Section were now to terminate that discussion and pass to the other important questions awaiting their consideration. He accordingly proposed that the Section should now take a decision on the Report submitted by the Commission with the amendments therein agreed upon by the Commission in the light of the discussion which had taken place. In order to make provision for the cases which still remained to be submitted to the Section, he proposed, as President of the Section, to put to the Section on each occasion the question whether the approval given by them to the Report by the Commission extended also to the further proposals then submitted.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session: 2nd Meeting.*)

Continuing, the President said that, in accordance with precedent, the Commission asked the Section first to give their specific approval for each and all of the individual recommendations set forth in their Report and, second, to approve the Report as a whole and to agree to its being submitted on their behalf to the Congress with an indication that it had been approved and adopted by the Section. This proposal was made on the understanding that if, as the result of the discussion of further items either during the present meeting or during the meetings to be held later that day, the Commission and the Section agreed to make any additions to the Report, he should be authorised to insert

therein the additions so agreed upon before the Report was submitted to the Congress.

MR. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) said that he had much pleasure in moving the adoption of the Commission's Report in the terms indicated by the President.

MR. R. WINCKWORTH (UNITED KINGDOM) then seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Dos Passos.

After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, in accordance with the request so made to him by the Section, he would present the Commission's Report to the Congress at the *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following day and, in doing so, would inform the Congress that the Report had been unanimously adopted by the Section.

Proposal that the "Comitè Permanent" be asked to propose to the Congress a Resolution to be sent to UNESCO stressing the extreme importance of the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

6. PROFESSOR J. CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) said that, following upon the discussion of the Commission's Report, he wished to bring to the special attention of the Section—and through the Section, that of the Congress as a whole—the extremely dangerous situation created by the fact that in existing conditions the entire existence of the Commission depended upon its securing for the Office of Secretary a zoologist who not only possessed exceptional vigour and knowledge of nomenclature but who was able also to devote long hours to the work of the Commission. The Commission were fortunate in having in Mr. Hemming an honorary Secretary who possessed these qualifications but, with the growing volume of the work of the Commission, it was becoming more and more difficult for Mr. Hemming to discharge all the duties which fell to his lot. Moreover, it was not reasonable to expect any honorary officer whose primary occupation lay in an entirely different field to devote almost the whole of his spare time to the work of the Commission. For the present, this was inevitable, but the position would remain extremely dangerous until the future existence of the Commission could be assured by securing for it funds both sufficiently large and sufficiently secure to enable the Commission to engage a whole-time salaried official, himself a zoologist of high standing, to whom could be delegated a large part of the numerous duties which now fell to the honorary Secretary to the Commission. Unfortunately, the Congress was not itself in a position to

do much to help in this matter but there was one thing which it could do and which he hoped that it would do. This was to adopt a Resolution at its final *Concilium Plenum* for transmission to UNESCO expressing the thanks of the Congress for the financial assistance now being given, stressing the fundamental importance of the work of the Commission and urging the continuance of financial support on the highest scale that could be provided. He accordingly proposed that the *Comité Permanent* of the Congress should be invited to bring forward a Resolution in this sense at the concluding *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning.

With the permission of the President, he (Professor J. Chester Bradley) would himself put this proposal to the Section, by whom, he felt confident, it would be adopted by acclamation.

On the motion being so put, THE SECTION adopted by acclamation the proposal brought forward by Professor J. Chester Bradley.

Fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles" (Paper I.C. (48) 16): procedure proposed in regard to

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the group of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* in various respects submitted in Commission Paper **I.C. (48)16.** Copies of this paper had been distributed earlier in the meeting at the same time as copies of the Commission's draft Report. Seventeen proposals were put forward in this paper, which contained the fourth instalment of such proposals submitted at the present Session. These proposals had for convenience of discussion been given serial numbers consecutive with those submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)15** and earlier papers. The present proposals were accordingly numbered (64) to (80). These proposals would need to be considered by the Commission before they were submitted to the Section, but, as the present meeting was not only a meeting of the Commission but also a meeting of the Section, he proposed that the Commission should be asked to consider these proposals in the presence of the Section and that, immediately upon the close of the discussion of these proposals by the Commission, the Commission's recommendations thereon should be reported to the Section for approval. This procedure had the double advantage both that it saved time, a consideration of great importance in the present stage of the labours of the Section, and also that it provided every member of the Section with an opportunity of being present at the dis-

cussion of these proposals by the Commission and of participating in that discussion to the full extent that he or she might desire.

THE SECTION approved the proposals of the President in regard to the procedure to be followed in considering the fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)16.**

Seventeen proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles"

8. THE SECTION had before them Commission Paper **I.C.(48)16** containing a fourth instalment of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* in regard to the following matters :—(64) the position of trivial names consisting of words that were totally misleading; (65) a clarification of the provisions of the Commission's *Opinion* 124, with special reference to the status of generic first published on the plates of volume 1 of Jacob Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schemetterlinge;* (66) the definition in the *Règles* of the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature; (67) the status of a holotype or lectotype in relation to a poor indication or description; (68) the clarification of a point left unsettled in the discussion on Point (30) in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)13;** (69) the proposed grant of official recognition to the expression "pseudo-genus"; (70) the proposed introduction of a new terminology for the naming of certain fossil fragments (organites and sclerites) of invertebrates; (71) the status of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Declarations* rendered under the judicial functions conferred upon them by the Congress; (72) the method to be followed in amending the *Règles*; (73) a suggested amplification of the proposal submitted in Point (34) in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)15;** (74) a suggested drafting amendment to the Article already agreed to be inserted in the *Règles* dealing with the Commission's plenary powers; (75) the proposed elimination from the Commission's *Opinion* 126 (which was concerned with the status of names published in d'Orbigny's "Prodrome") of a passage which was not only irrelevant but which had the appearance of giving a ruling on the status of "neotypes", a question which the Section had already agreed should be deferred for further consideration at the next meeting of the Congress; (76) the insertion of corrected examples under section (b) of the second *Recommandation* to Article 8; (77) and (78) the insertion of paragraph numbers for paragraphs of particular Articles and the splitting-up of Articles dealing with more than one subject, so that each subject should be dealt with in a separate paragraph; (79) the meaning of the expression "species inquirenda" as used in

Rule (e) in Article 30; (80) the proposed insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* to authors to abstain from using the expression "genotype". When considering proposals (77) and (80), the Commission had agreed also to recommend (1) that serial numbers should be given to *Recommandations* in cases where more than one *Recommandation* was attached to a given Article of the *Règles* (in the same way as, under proposal (77), serial numbers were to be given to each paragraph of an Article in cases where an Article contained more than one paragraph), (2) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in Article 30 urging authors, when writing of the concept of the "type species of a genus" invariably to use the expression "type species" (*espèce type*). Finally, when approving proposal (65), the Commission had agreed that the decision then taken should apply not only to the intermediate terms used between generic and trivial names by Hübner (J.) in the first volume of his *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* but also to the similar terms used by that author in his *Systematisch-Alphabetisches Verzeichniss.*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Minute* 2)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said, in accordance with the decision just taken by the Section, he had now to declare the present meeting of the Section to be temporarily adjourned to enable the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider, and formulate recommendations on, the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)16.** He would call the Section to order immediately the Commission had completed this task.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had formally to report to the Section that the Commission had now completed their examination of the proposals submitted in Paper **I.C.(48)16.** The Commission had rejected Proposal (64) but, subject to certain amendments, had adopted Proposals (65) to (80) (both inclusive). He did not propose to take up the time of the Section in recapitulating the discussion which had taken place in the Commission, since that discussion had taken place in the presence of the Section.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Minute* 5)

PROFESSOR J. CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) then proposed a motion that the Section approve the recommendations submitted by the Commission on Proposals (65) to (80) set forth in Paper **I.C.(48)16** and that, in accordance with the procedure agreed upon when the Commission's Report was under consideration, the approval

so given be taken as having been signified at the time when they approved the Report of the Commission.

PROFESSOR HAROLD KIRBY (U.S.A.) seconded the motion proposed by Professor J. Chester Bradley.

After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Necator Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda): Validation of erroneous entry in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"

9. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he now proposed to invite the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the action to be taken in regard to an erroneous entry in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology". The entry in question was that relating to the name *Necator* Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda), which had been placed on the "Official List" by the Commission in *Opinion* 66 but which had now been found to be invalid, it being a homonym of *Necator* Sclater & Saunders, 1896, an emendation of *Nicator* Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870 (Class Aves). The President accordingly invited the Section to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider this matter in the presence of the members of the Section.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the Commission had decided to use their plenary powers to validate the entry of the name *Necator* Stiles, 1903, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by suppressing for this purpose the name *Necator* Sclater & Saunders, 1896, a name not in use by ornithologists.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the above Report.

Applications relating to certain generic names in the Phylum Mollusca

10. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had received a communication from Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom) (whom all the Section were glad to see once more restored to health) stating that it would be necessary for him to leave the afternoon's meeting before its close in order to attend another urgent engagement and expressing the hope that, as he was much interested in several applications for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers in relation to the names of certain important genera in the Phylum Mollusca, it might be possible for these cases to be considered while he was present. He (the President) felt that it was important

that Mr. Winckworth should be present when these matters were discussed and he felt confident therefore that the Section would be willing to agree to the slight re-arrangement in their time-table which would be necessary to meet Mr. Winckworth's wishes. He (the President) hoped that the members of the Section would remain in their places while the applications in question were considered by the Commission and would take part in the discussion of those cases to the full extent which they might desire. He would call the meeting of the Section to order immediately the Commission had reached conclusions on the applications in question.

THE SECTION thereupon agreed to adjourn to enable the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the applications referred to by the President.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had formally to report to the Section that the International Commission had agreed to use their plenary powers in the under-mentioned cases, having satisfied themselves that, in default of their so doing, greater confusion than uniformity would ensue :—

(1) to validate the current use of the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchiata) by suppressing *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1758, by validating *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, by amending the name *Laplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, to *Aplysia*, and by designating type species for these genera in harmony with existing usage ;

(2) to designate *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Eulamellibranchia) ;

(3) to designate *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda, Order Bullamorpha).

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the foregoing Report.

Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : time appointed

11. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said, that in view of the hour, he proposed that the Section and the Commission should now adjourn. The next meeting, which, like the present meeting, would consist of concurrent meetings both of the Section and of the Commission, would be held at 14.45 hours that afternoon.

(*The Section thereupon adjourned at* 12.25 *hours*)

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Fourth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 1445 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Twelfth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
M. Belloc (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
M. G. Ranson (France)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Procedure to be adopted during the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, as announced at the meeting held that morning, the present meeting was a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held concurrently with a meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Part of the meeting would be devoted to receiving from members of the Section the communications which stood in their name on the Programme of the Congress. The remainder of the meeting would be devoted to matters which fell in the first instance within the province of the International Commission and to the submission to the Section of the recommendations of the Commission on those matters.

Type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda)

2. M. GILBERT RANSON (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled " Quelle est l'espèce ' type ' du genre *Gryphaea* Lamarck ?" [11]. M. Ranson said that the question of the type of the genus *Gryphaea* had been the subject of much discussion. This generic name had been first published by Lamarck in 1801 in the " Addition " to his " Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres ". It should be noted that Lamarck explained in the " Avertissement " to the " Système " that under each genus he proposed to cite one or, very rarely, two species, together with some synonyms. For the genus *Gryphaea* he cited nine species. Of these *G. angulata* Lamarck was the first and *G. arcuata* was the fourth. In a note Lamarck announced his intention of characterising in his " tableau général " those species here referred to only by name. At the time when Lamarck published his " Système ", the conception of a " type " for a genus had not yet established itself. In 1823, however, Children did select " types " for the genera recognised by Lamarck in his " Histoire Naturelle des Animaux Sans Vertèbres ". It had to be admitted however that Lamarck had cited *Gryphaea angulata* as the first example of his genus *Gryphaea*. It could not be doubted that he had based it upon the unique example of this species which he had just received, an example which was now preserved in the collection of the Paris Museum and which had been figured by Delessert in 1841.

In the " Histoire Naturelle " of 1819 Lamarck described *G. angulata* for the first time, placing it at the head of the list of species of this genus. Various authors had published works on the Mollusca between the appearance in 1801 of Lamarck's " Système " and the publication in 1819 of his " Histoire Naturelle ", but none of these authors had designated a type species. The designation of *Gryphaea angulata* by Children in 1823, to which reference had been made was based however upon the " Histoire Naturelle " of 1819 and not upon the " Système " of 1801. As such, the validity of Children's action was contested by Mr. Winckworth of London, who held that the first valid type designation for the genus *Gryphaea* was that of *Gryphaea arcuata* by Anton in 1839.

The question thus arose whether the type species of *Gryphaea* should be selected from the species included in the " Système " of 1801 or from those of the " Histoire Naturelle " of 1819. If the first of these courses was necessary, it had to be noted that *Gryphaea angulata*, the species selected by Children (1823) as the type, had not been described or figured at the time of the publication of the " Système " in 1801, the name *Gryphaea angulata* being at

[11] For the text of the communication made by M. Ranson, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 168–170.

that date no more than a *nomen nudum*. It was for this reason that authors had been led to accept as the type of *Gryphaea* the next species to be so designated after 1823. The species in question was *Gryphaea arcuata*.

It was for consideration therefore whether it was possible to take the " Système " into account in this matter. The Commission itself (in *Opinion* 79) had ruled that, if the rules were rigidly construed, the " Système " could not be accepted as a work in which the types of genera were designated. It should be noted also that Lamarck in the " Histoire Naturelle " (1819) appeared to have taken the same view, for he there made a number of changes in the treatment which he had adopted in the " Système ". Nevertheless, in both these works Lamarck placed *Gryphaea angulata* at the head of the list of species of the genus *Gryphaea*.

Continuing, M. Ranson said that he concluded that it was not possible to look to the " Système " for the type of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck. It was necessary therefore to turn for this purpose to the " Histoire Naturelle " of 1819, as Children had done in 1823. The first designation of a type species for this genus was therefore the designation by Children of *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1819.

MR. R. WINCKWORTH (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the proposal submitted by M. Ranson was open to the serious objection that the species proposed to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck had not been described or figured at the time (1801) when this generic name was first published by Lamarck. It was true that on that occasion Lamarck did cite the name *Gryphaea angulata* but at that time that name was a *nomen nudum*. There was however, another serious objection to the course proposed by M. Ranson. As established by Lamarck in 1801, the genus *Gryphaea* contained a number of fossil species and three *nomina nuda*, of which *Gryphaea angulata* was one. That name, when validated by Lamarck in 1819, had been applied to a living species. The generic name was now accepted by palaeontologists for fossil species, *Gryphaea arcuata* being recognised as the type. The acceptance of M. Ranson's proposal would therefore disturb palaeontological practice. The generic name *Crassostrea* Sacco, 1897, was available for *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1819.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) thanked M. Ranson for the communication which he had made to the Section. As M. Ranson himself realised, there were difficulties in the course which he advocated; the question at issue was not one on which the Section on

Nomenclature could itself pronounce an opinion and the matter would have to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for consideration and decision.

Communications announced but not yet made to the Section : procedure to be adopted in regard to

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the communication just made to the Section completed the portion of the programme of the Section devoted to receiving communications from members of the Congress. There were however two other papers, the titles of which appeared in the " Horaire prévu pour les exposés " which had been circulated to the members of the Congress by the Secretary-General. These stood in the names of Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) and himself (the President). He (the President) did not propose to communicate to the Section the paper which he had prepared for that purpose, considering it important at the stage which had been reached that the whole of the remaining available time of the Section should be devoted to the consideration of concrete problems brought forward by the Commission. Professor Metcalf's paper, which was entitled " Static versus Dynamic Nomenclature ", dealt with a subject on which a large number of decisions had been taken during the past week. All the members of the Section would regret that, through indisposition, Professor Metcalf had been unable to present his communication on this subject.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the statement made by the President.

Proposals relating to three individual nomenclatorial problems

4. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there were three problems concerned with individual cases of nomenclature in which many members of the Section were interested which he proposed should next be considered. These problems were (1) the nomenclatorial status of Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 ; (2) the status of the names published for spiders by Clerck in his *Aranei svecici* of 1757 (on which a preliminary discussion had taken place at the time of the presentation of Professor Pierre Bonnet's proposal on this subject ; (3) the relative merits of the generic names *Schistosoma* and *Bilharzia*. He (the President) proposed that the Section should ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, which (as the Section were aware) was holding a meeting concurrently with the present meeting, to consider these proposals in the presence of the Section and that immediately upon the close of the discussion on those proposals the conclusions reached by the Commission should be formally reported to the Section.

THE SECTION approved the proposals made by the President and accordingly adjourned to enable the Inter-

national Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the three applications to which the President had referred.

(*On resumption*)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Minute* 6)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had (1) decided to recommend that a proviso should be added to Article 26 of the *Règles* in order to bring within the scope of that Article the names published in 1757 by Clerck for certain spiders in his work *Aranei svecici,* the names in question to rank for nomenclatorial purposes as from 1758 and to take precedence over names published by Linnaeus in that year in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*[12], (2) had agreed that the generic names published by Brünnich in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 complied with the requirements of Article 25, for although in that treatise Brünnich had not dealt with categories lower than that of the genus, he had applied in that work the principles of binominal nomenclature, and had agreed further to recommend the insertion in Article 25 of words making it clear that, in the case of generic names published prior to 1st January 1931, it was not necessary that, in the work concerned, the author should have cited the trivial names of species, provided that it was clear that in the book in question that author had applied the principles of binominal nomenclature ; (3) had agreed to use their plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, the position of the latter name on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " being at the same time confirmed. While considering the case of Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, the Commission had agreed to use their plenary powers to validate the generic name *Cercopithecus* as from Linnaeus, 1758, (with type species, *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758), thereby giving valid force to the incorrect entry in regard to this name made in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " under a faulty decision embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 104. Further, the generic name *Tonna* Brünnich, 1771, had been added to the "Official List" and investigations had been set on foot in regard to the status to be accorded to certain generic names which, if Brisson's *Regnum animale* of 1762 should be found to be unavailable, had first been published by Brünnich in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta of* 1771. The recommendations now submitted to the Section had been agreed to by the Commission unanimously, but their conclusions in regard to the application relating to the name *Bilharzia* had been dissented from by Professor Mansour.

[12] For the record of the discussion in regard to this question by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 315–319.

THE SECTION approved the recommendations submitted in favour of the amendment of Article 26 and the clarification of Article 25 in the manner proposed and took note of, and approved, the action decided upon by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the other matters reported.

Fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles" (Paper I.C. (48) 17)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Minute 8)

5. THE SECTION had before them Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17,** containing the fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* which had been submitted for the consideration of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section. This paper contained thirteen proposals which had been numbered consecutively with the proposals submitted in the fourth and earlier instalments and appeared therefore as proposals (81) to (93). The subjects dealt with in this Paper, copies of which had already been distributed, were :—(81) the amplification of the proposed Article relating to the Commission's plenary powers ; (82) the extension of the plenary powers to cover cases where confusion arose through the impossibility of determining how the *Règles* should be applied in certain cases ; (83) the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision governing the composition of the Commission and (84) defining the extent to which the Commission should be free to vary its By-Laws ; (85) the application of Article 28 in relation to trivial names; (86) and (87) the extension of the scope of the First and Second Schedules to the *Règles* and the repeal of *Opinions* when decisions recorded therein are entered on either of these Schedules ; (88) the establishment of further Schedules, the first for the reception of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," the second for a new Official List, the " Official List of Specific Trivial names in Zoology " and the similar recording of Indexes of rejected and invalid names ; (89) the cancellation of certain of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission which either contained no effective decision or, by reason of their transitory character, had lost all significance or were otherwise unsatisfactory in whole or in part ; (90) supplementary decisions in regard to matters dealt with in certain *Opinions* needed before the rulings given in those *Opinions* could usefully be inserted in the Schedules concerned ; (91) the correction of errors in certain *Opinions* prior to the insertion of the contents of those *Opinions* in the Schedules concerned; (92) the insertion in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " of an indication of the gender of each generic name standardised in this way ; (93) arrangements proposed to be made for the early publication of particulars of changes made in the *Règles* by the present Congress, the date of their entry into force, and the insertion in the *Règles* of an Article on this subject.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Minute* 7)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that, in this and certain similar cases shortly to be brought forward, the Section should follow the precedent which they had set at their meeting held that morning and should adjourn to enable the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider in the presence of the members of the Section the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17** and, with the assistance of the members of the Section, to formulate recommendations thereon. Immediately the Commission had completed their examination of these proposals, he (the President) would call the Section to order, so that a report might be made to the Section on the recommendations agreed upon by the Commission at the immediately preceding public meeting.

THE SECTION approved the proposals submitted by the President and agreed to adjourn to enable the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to examine the recommendations submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17.**

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had formally to report to the Section that the Commission had now completed their examination of the proposals in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17.** The Commission had agreed to recommend the adoption of all the proposals in this paper, subject only to certain minor amendments agreed upon in the course of the discussion. In the case of Proposal (85) the Commission recommended that words should be incorporated in the provision proposed to be inserted in Article 28 to secure that, where the application of the new provision would result in a change in the trivial name of a species of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields in biology, that change was not to be made without the prior approval of the Commission. On Point (90) the Commission recommended a drafting amendment in the Article embodying the plenary powers.

It was then proposed and seconded that the recommendation submitted by the Commission be adopted. After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section to move an amendment to this proposal, should he so desire and no such amendment had been brought forward, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles" (Paper I.C. (48) 18)

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the group of

ten miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)18**, copies of which had been distributed. This Paper contained a sixth instalment of ten proposals which had been numbered consecutively with those submitted in the fifth and earlier instalments and appeared therefore as Proposals (94) to (103). The questions dealt with in these proposals included :—(94) the problem of identical trivial names in relation to the Law of Homonymy, where those names were published in different genera which, through the accident of generic homonymy, bore the same name ; (95) a loophole left in the definition of the expression " indication " as used in Article 25 ; (96) an ambiguity in the decision in *Opinion* 46 which required to be cleared up before that decision was incorporated in Article 30 in accordance with the decision taken when Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11** had been under consideration ; (97) the need for ensuring a rigorous application of Rule (g) in Article 30 ; (98) the case where species or subspecies are enumerated in a list in which the trivial names are preceded by a serial letter or numeral ; (99) the date of entry into force of the *Règles*, as revised by the present (Paris) Congress ; (100) the relation of the decision in *Opinion* 116 to Article 34 ; (101) the need for the further elucidation of the decision in regard to manuscript names taken when Proposal (12) in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11** was under consideration ; (102) the position in relation to Article 25 of generic names first published in synonymies of species ; (103) the content of generic names first published in generic synonymies.

In accordance with the decision taken in connection with the consideration of Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17**, THE SECTION agreed to adjourn to enable the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to consider the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)18**, at a public meeting held in the presence of the members of the Section.

(*On resumption*)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had formally to report the conclusions reached by the Commission on the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)18**. Subject only to minor drafting changes agreed upon in the course of the discussion, the Commission had agreed to recommend the adoption of Proposals (94) to (98), (101) and (102). As regards the remaining Proposals, Proposal (99) was an inadvertent duplicate of Proposal (93) in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)17** on which a decision had already been taken. The Proposal (100) had been rejected by the Commission who took the view that the question at

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Minute* 13)

issue had been satisfactorily covered by the second supplementary decision taken during the consideration of Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11** which had been reported to the Section at its Second Meeting. Finally, as regards Proposal (103), the Commission were of the opinion that the problem presented by generic names published in generic synonymies was so complex that a thorough investigation was desirable before any definite action was taken. The Commission had therefore invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a detailed study of the problem, in consultation with specialists, and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress.

It was then proposed and seconded that the recommendations submitted by the Commission, including the amended proposal submitted in lieu of Proposal (100), be adopted. After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section to move an amendment to this proposal, should he so desire, and no such amendment had been brought forward, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Fifth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : time appointed

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, with the completion of their examination of the recommendations of the Commission on the proposals submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)18,** the Section had almost completed their labours for the present Congress, for the only other matter on the Agenda of the Commission was the consideration of a large number of applications relating to individual cases. The Commission would wish to report to the Section the conclusions which they had reached on those applications and the most satisfactory course would be for the Section and the Commission to continue to sit concurrently for this purpose. The Section and the Commission had now been sitting continuously for over two hours and he suggested that it might be to the general convenience of all concerned if the Section and the Commission were now to adjourn for three quarters of an hour. He accordingly proposed that there should be an adjournment until half past five o'clock.

(*The Section thereupon adjourned at* 1635 *hours.*)

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Fifth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 1730 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the Thirteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
M. Belloc (France)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Eight applications on individual cases submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: Paper I.C. (48) 19

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the first matter to be considered was the group of eight applications on individual cases on which recommendations had been submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)19,** copies of which had been distributed. These proposals were concerned with: (1) the need to complete *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in cases where those *Opinions* did not give complete answers to the questions submitted; (2) the addition to the "Official List" of the generic name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), to complete the decision recorded in *Opinion* 82; (3) the correction in the "Official List" of the entry relating to the generic name *Mabuya* Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia); (4) a proposal for the use of the plenary powers in the case of the generic name *Porina* Walker, 1856 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera); (5) the question whether the spelling of the generic name *Flebotomus* Rondani, 1840 (Class Insecta,

Order Diptera) should be emended to *Phlebotomus* ; (6) the proposed use of the plenary powers to determine the identity of the species to which the specific name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), should apply ; (7) the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) ; (8) the status of certain alleged generic and specific trivial names published for Schistosome monsters.

The President explained that these cases were all cases which could be dealt with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature under their own powers. The Commission would greatly appreciate the assistance of members of the Section in the discussion both of these applications and also of the similar applications which were due to be considered immediately after the present item had been disposed of. Quite apart from this desire on the part of the Commission, it would be necessary for the action agreed upon by the Commission in regard to these cases to be reported to the Section in order that the Congress might be fully informed in regard to all matters on which decisions had been reached by the Commission during the present (Paris) Session. He (the President) proposed therefore that the Section should remain in session while individual cases were under consideration by the Commission, thereby both enabling the members of the Section to take a full part in the discussion of those cases and making it possible to dispense with the necessity for a detailed report to be made by the Commission on the decisions taken by them on the applications in question.

In accordance with the procedure suggested by the President, THE SECTION then participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the eight applications enumerated in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)19**, and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission thereon. In addition, as regards proposal (8), the Section approved the proposal of the Commission that the decision which they had reached should be formally recorded by the insertion in the *Règles* of an express provision that names given to monsters possess no status in zoological nomenclature.

Two applications published in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

2. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the undermentioned cases published in Part 5 of volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and took note of, and approved, the decisions taken by the Commission in regard thereto :—

(1) the status for nomenclatorial purposes of Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte ;*

(2) the question whether steps should be taken under the Commission's plenary powers to render available under Article 25 some or all of the generic names published by Geoffroy (E. L.) in 1762 in the non-binominal work *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*, with special reference to the name *Corixa* Geoffroy;

(3) the proposed suppression for nomenclatorial purposes of the pamphlet entitled " Buprestidae " privately and anonymously published by Hope (F.W.) in 1836.

Eighteen applications published in Part 8 of Volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

3. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following eighteen applications published in Part 8 of volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in regard thereto :—

(1) the question of the validity of the designations of type species by Koch (C.L.), 1837–1842, *Übersicht des Arachnidensystems*, for certain genera, the names of which had been first published by that author in 1835–1842, *Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden* ;

(2) the question of the oldest available trivial name for the species renamed *Diaptomus vulgaris* by Schmeil in 1897 (Class Crustacea, Order Copepoda) ;

(3) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Graptolithus* Linnaeus, 1768 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) ;

(4) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the names *Lomatoceras* Bronn, 1834, and *Monoprion* Barrande, 1850, and to validate the name *Monograptus* (emend. of *Monograpsus*) Geinitz, 1852 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) ;

(5) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Gladiolites* Barrande, 1850, and to validate the name *Retiolites* Barrande, 1850 (Class Graptolithina, Order Graptoloidea) ;

(6) the question of the type species of *Diplodinium* Schuberg, 1888 (Class Ciliophora) ;

(7) the status of the generic name *Aspidoproctus* Newstead, 1901 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(8) the status of the generic name *Phoranthella* Townsend, 1915 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) ;

(9) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Diadema* Humphreys, 1797 (Class Echinoidea, Order Aulodonta) ;

(10) the relative merits of the names Polyplacophora and Loricata as the name for the Class known as " Chitons " in the Phylum Mollusca ;

(11) the question of the holotype of *Fasciola ovata* Rudolphi, 1803 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) ;

(12) the relative status of the generic names *Petalifera* Gray, 1847, and *Aplysiella* Fischer, 1872 (Class Gastropoda, Order Aplysiomorpha) ;

(13) the question whether *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1830 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda), is a homonym of *Acmea* (=emended form of *Acme*) Hartmann, 1821 (Class Gastropoda, Order Mesogastropoda) ;

(14) the proposed use of the plenary powers to determine the holotype of *Ammonites cordatus* Sowerby, 1813 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) ;

(15) the proposed use of the plenary powers to vary the type selection of the genus *Actinote* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) ;

(16) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Neuroptera) ;

(17) the question whether the specific name *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804, is to be regarded as a homonym of the name *Acarus alatus* Schrank, 1803, a name given to an unrecognisable species (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) ;

(18) the proposed emendation of the name *Palaeaneilo* Hall (J.), 1869 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Protobranchia) to *Palaeoneilo*.

THE SECTION approved the recommendations submitted by the Commission for the clarification of Article 35 in regard to the issue raised by case (17) above (*Acarus alatus*). Finally, with reference to case (10) above, THE SECTION approved the proposal of the Commission that Commissioner Francis Hemming (Secretary to the Commission) should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the category Sub-Order (*Sub-Ordo*), and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress.

Twenty-Three applications published in Part 9 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

4. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following twenty-three applications published in Part 9 of volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in regard thereto :—

(1) the procedure to be followed in determining the name of a family based upon the union on taxonomic grounds of two or more existing families ;

(2) the date as from which the names published in Pallas (P.S.), *Zoographia rosso-asiatica* are to be treated as having been published ;

(3) the proposed suppression of the generic name *Clavellarius* Olivier, 1789 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera),consequent upon the validation of the name *Cimbex* Olivier, 1790 ;

(4) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Bombus* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), with *Apis terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species ;

(5) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Ceratina* Latreille [1802–1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), with *Apis albilabris* Fabricius, 1793, as type species ;

(6) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Pemphredon tristis* Van der Linden, 1829, as the type species of *Diodontus* Curtis, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) ;

(7) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) ;

(8) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Gorytes* Latreille, [March 1804], and to validate the same name as from Latreille, [Sept. 1804] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) ;

(9) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Harpactus* as from Shuckard, 1837, with *Arpactus formosus* Jurine, 1807, as type species (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) ;

(10) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Macropis* Panzer, [1806–1809] (type species : *Megilla labiata* Fabricius, [1804–1805]) by suppressing the designation of the above species as the type species of *Megilla* Fabricius, [1804–1805] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) ;

(11) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Apis centuncularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Megachile* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(12) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Methoca ichneumonides* Latreille, [Sept. 1804], as the type species of *Methoca* (emend. of *Methocha*) Latreille, [March 1804] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(13) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Notozus* Förster, 1853, by suppressing the name *Elampus* Spinola, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(14) the use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Nysso* Latreille, 1796, and to validate the name *Nysson* Latreille, 1802 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(15) the use of the plenary powers to designate *Vespa spinipes* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Odynerus* Latreille, [1802–1803] (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(16) the use of the plenary powers to designate *Formica contracta* Latreille, 1801, as the type species of *Ponera* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(17) the use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Euplilis* Risso, 1826, in order thereby to validate the name *Rhopalum* Stephens, 1829 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(18) the use of the plenary powers to designate *Crabro continuus* Fabricius, 1805, as the type species of *Solenius* Lepeletier & Brullé, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(19) the use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *Sphex vagus* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate the name *Vespa arvensis* Linnaeus, 1758, for the same species (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(20) the use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *Apis agrorum* Schrank, 1781, and to validate the name *Apis agrorum* Fabricius, 1787, for the species commonly known as *Bombus agrorum* (Fabricius, 1787) (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera);

(21) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Erycina pellucida* Lamarck, 1805, as the type species of the genus *Erycina* Lamarck, 1805 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Heterodonta);

(22) the status for nomenclatorial purposes of Gesner (J.), 1758, *Tractatus physicus de Petrificatis*;

(23) the question whether the generic names *Liodes* Heyden, 1826 (Class Arachnida, Order Acarina) and *Leiodes* Latreille, 1796, are homonyms of one another.

Report to the Congress: supplementary items

(*Previous reference: Paris Session. 3rd Meeting, Minute* 5)

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that when, at their meeting held in the morning of the same day, the Section had approved the Report submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and had invited him to submit it to the Congress on their behalf, with an indication that it had been approved and adopted by the Section, they had agreed also that if, as the result of discussions in the Section subsequent to the adoption of the Commission's Report, the Commission and the Section were to agree to make any additions to the Report, the additions so agreed upon should be made before the Report was submitted to the Congress. There were two points arising out of this decision to which he (the President) wished to refer. The first was concerned with the interpretation of the Report; the second involved the insertion in the Report of an additional sentence. As regards the first of these points, it was important that it should be clearly placed on record that the approval of the Commission's Report signified by the Section at their morning's meeting applied not only to the recommendations submitted to the Section by the Commission up to the time when at that meeting the approval of the Section was so signified but also to recommendations submitted by the Commission to the Section and approved by the Section in the period between the adoption by the Section of the Commission's Report and the close of the final meeting of the Section during the present (Paris) Congress, for it was essential that at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning the Congress should have the views of the Section on all the conclusions reached. In order to clear the position in this regard up to the close of the present meeting, he (the President) asked the Section to place on record that the approval of the recommendations submitted by the Commission in regard to the amendment of the *Règles* recorded by the Section in approving and adopting the Commission's Report applied not only to the recommendations submitted to, and approved by, the

Section up to that moment, but also to the recommendations similarly submitted and approved (1) in the portion of the 3rd Meeting of the Section held subsequent to the adoption by the Section of the Commission's Report, (2) during the 4th Meeting of the Section held at 1445 hours that afternoon and (3) during the present (5th) Meeting. The second of the points to which he (the President) had referred was concerned with the insertion in the Report of the Commission of a sentence referring to the fact that during their present (Paris) Session the Commission had reached decisions on a large number of applications submitted to them on individual nomenclatorial problems. It had always been the hope of the Commission to make progress in this field during the Paris Session, but it had not been possible to insert a reference to this matter in the draft Report which had been considered that morning, for up to that time the Commission had not been able to devote any time to the consideration of individual applications, the whole of their energies having been directed to the consideration of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. The President therefore asked the Section to place on record in the way that he had suggested their endorsement of the recommendations submitted by the Commission during the period to which he had referred and at the same time to approve the insertion in the Commission's Report of a sentence on the lines proposed, relating to the consideration by the Commission of individual applications during their Paris Session.

After the Commission had signified their approval of the insertion in their Report of the proposed additional sentence, THE SECTION approved the proposals submitted by the President.

Sixth (and Final) Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature : time appointed

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there still remained a number of applications relating to individual cases, on which the Commission were anxious to reach decisions before the close of the Congress. There would therefore be a further meeting of the Commission that evening at 2030 hours. That meeting, like the present meeting, be a concurrent meeting both of the Commission and of the Section.

(*The Section thereupon adjourned at* 1910 *hours.*)

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION OF NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Sixth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 2030 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the Fourteenth Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PRESENT:

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Fourteen applications published in Part 10 of Volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

1. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following 14 applications published in Part 10 of volume 1 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in regard thereto :—

(1) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Raphistoma* Rafinesque, 1815 (Class Pisces, Order Synentognathi) and to validate the generic name *Raphistoma* Hall, 1847 (Class Gastropoda, Order Archaeogastropoda) ;

(2) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Teleosteus* Volger, 1860, and the specific name *Teleosteus primaevus* Volger, 1860 (Class Anthozoa) ;

(3) the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* in relation to the specific trivial name *mcfarlandi* as used in the specific name *Chromodoris mcfarlandi* Cockerell, 1902 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchia) ;

(4) the status of the name commonly cited as *Piroplasma annulatum* Dschunkowsky and Luhs, 1904 (Class Sporozoa, Order Coccidiida) ;

(5) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Trematapis schmidti* Rohon, 1892, as the type

species of the genus *Trematapsis* Schmidt, 1866 (Class Cephalaspidomorphi, Order Osteostraci);

(6) the proposed use of the plenary powers to determine the identity of *Anomia pecten* Linnaeus, 1758, with the species belonging to the Order Protremata (Class Brachiopoda) commonly known as *Strophomena pecten* (Linnaeus, 1758);

(7) the question of the type species of the genus *Chinchilla* Bennett, 1829 (Class Mammalia, Order Rodentia);

(8) the status of the name *Aturoidea* Vredenburg, 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Nautiloidea);

(9) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Carabus collaris* Paykull, 1798, as the type species of the genus *Bradycellus* Erichson, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(10) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Carabus granulatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Carabus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(11) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Carabus aeneus* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of the genus *Harpalus* Latreille [1802–1803], and *Carabus obscurus* Fabricius, 1792, as the type species of the genus *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(12) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, as the type species of the genus *Lebia* Latreille [1802–1803] (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(13) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Tachys scutellaris* Stephens, 1828, as the type species of the genus *Tachys* Stephens, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(14) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781, as the type species of the genus *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera).

Seventeen applications published in Part 11 of Volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

2. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following 17 applications published in Part 11 of volume 1 of the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached by the Commission in regard thereto:—

(1) the determination of the holotype of *Dinornis*

novaezealandiae Owen, 1843 (Class Aves, Order Dirnornithoformes);

(2) the status for nomenclatorial purposes of Martin (W.) 1793, *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifactions collected in Derbyshire*, and 1809, *Petrificata Derbiensia;*

(3) the question whether eight generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) commonly accepted as having been first published by Fabricius in 1807 were published by Illiger earlier in the same year;

(4) the proposed emendation to *Hygrobia* of the generic name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera);

(5) the question of the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera);

(6) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and to validate the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(7) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(8) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773, as the type species of the genus *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(9) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex purpureolineatus* Rossi, 1790, as the type species of the genus *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(10) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763, as the type species of the genus *Beosus* Amyot and Serville, 1843 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(11) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868, as the type species of the genus *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(12) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844, as the type species of the genus *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera);

(13) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, as the type species of the genus *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(14) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, as the type species of the genus *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(15) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas and Scott, 1868, as the type species of the genus *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(16) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767, as the type species of the genus *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;

(17) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Cimex antillarum* Kirkaldy, 1909, as the type species of the genus *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera).

Twenty-one applications submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by individual specialists

3. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following 21 applications which had been submitted by various specialists and were awaiting decision, and took note of, and approved, the conclusions reached, and the recommendations submitted, by the Commission in regard thereto :—

(1) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *Papilio idas* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate the name *Papilio idas* Linnaeus, 1761, as the name for the species formerly known as *Lycaena argyrognomon* (Bergstrasser, 1779) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (file Z.N.(S.)60) ;

(2) the proposed addition of the names of five genera in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and of the names of three genera in the same Order to the " Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology " (file Z.N.(S.)119) ;

(3) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes the recently discovered anonymous pamphlet published in 1840 under the title *'Verzeichniss einer aus Java übersandten sehr ansehnlichen Sammlung Thieren aller Classen* (known as the " Hildesheim List ") containing a number of overlooked specific names for species of the Classes Mammalia and Aves (file Z.N.(S.)196) ;

(4) the measures to be taken to determine the names to be applied to the genera in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) for which names were given by Hübner (J.) in the pamphlet entitled the "Tentamen" rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Commission's *Opinion* 97 (file Z.N.(S.)314);

(5) the use of the plenary powers to determine the identity of the species named *Papilio podalirius* by Linnaeus in 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (file Z.N.(S.)183);

(6) the problem of the identity of the species to which a given specific name applies where that name is based partly upon specimens and partly upon a previously published nominal species, the name of which is rejected by the author of the new name (files Z.N.(S.)179 and 180) (on which subject the Commission invited the Secretary to make a study in consultation with interested specialists, and to submit a Report, with recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress);

(7) the question whether Meuschen applied the principles of binominal nomenclature in his index to the *Zoolophylacium gronovianum* of Gronovius published in 1781 (file Z.N.(S.)311);

(8) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, as the type species of the genus *Tomocerus* Nicolet, 1842 (Class Insecta, Order Collembola) (file Z.N.(S.)199);

(9) the question of the type species of the genus *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (file Z.N.(S.)204);

(10) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, and to validate the generic name *Archaeodicaris* M'Coy, 1844 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) (file Z.N.(S.)320);

(11) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Spatagus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, as the type species of the genus *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck, 1816, as the type species of the genus *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida) (file Z.N.(S.)318);

(12) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate as from Brandt, 1835, the generic names *Phyllacanthus* and *Strongylocentrotus* (Class Echinoidea, Orders

Cidaroida and Camarodonta) and to designate as the type species for the first of these genera the species *Phyllacanthus dubius* Brandt, 1835, and for the second, *Echinus drobachiensis* Müller (O.R.), 1776 (file Z.N.(S.)319) ;

(13) the proposed use of the plenary powers :—

(a) to validate the generic name *Spatangus* as from Gray, 1825, with *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, as type species ;

(b) to validate the generic name *Ova* Gray, 1825, with *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816, as type species ;

(c) to validate the generic name *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836], with *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz. 1840, as type species ;

(d) to validate the generic name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, with *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, as type species, and the generic name *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, with *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, as type species ;

(e) to validate the generic name *Brissus* Gray, 1825, with *Spatangus brissus* Leske, var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778, as type species (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida) (file Z.N.(S.)317) ;

(14) the proposed use of the plenary powers :—

(a) to designate *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Arachnoides* Leske, 1778,

(b) to validate the generic name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, with *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816, as type species, and

(c) to validate *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778, with *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778, as the type species (Class Echinoidea) (file Z.N.(S.)322) ;

(15) the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the entry in *Opinion* 92 relating to the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by designating *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali) (file Z.N.(S.)156) ;

(16) the proposed use of the plenary powers to determine the identity of the species named *Papilio iris* by Linnaeus in 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (file Z.N.(S.)184) ;

(17) the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific names *Papilio ascanius* Linnaeus, 1769, and *Papilio aristolochiae* Pallas if published prior to the publication of the specific name *Papilio aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775, and to validate the last-cited specific name (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (file Z.N.(S.)186);

(18) the status for nomenclatorial purposes of Zimmermann, 1777, *Specimen Zoologiae geographicae*, and of Zimmermann, 1778–1783, *Geographische Geschichte* (file Z.N.(S.)182);

(19) the status for nomenclatorial purposes of Frisch, 1775, *Das Natur-System der vierfüssigen Thiere* (file Z.N.(S.)254);

(20) the problem of the name *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, as the name of the Virginia Deer (file Z.N.(S.)182);

(21) report by the Secretary on the efforts made since the meeting of the Commission held at Lisbon in 1935 to secure a settlement of the controversy centring around the names published by Meigen in 1800 for certain genera in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta) (file Z.N.(S.)191).

Article 25 : additional provisions relating to rivial names which, prior to being published in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, were either manuscript names or "*nomina nuda*"

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 18 *&* 24)

4. THE SECTION participated in the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on Notes 3 and 5 to the re-issue of the Commission's *Opinion* 4 (published in 1944) and approved recommendations by the Commission: (a) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear in the proposed consolidation of the decision given in *Opinion* 4 (for which see the proposals submitted in paragraph 12 of the list of proposals included in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11**) that the decision given in that *Opinion* does not apply to pre-1758 names published in 1758 or later, the status of such names being regulated by the provisions now to be inserted in Article 25 to give effect to the decision previously given by the Commission in their *Opinion* 5 (see the proposals on this point submitted in paragraph 21 of the list submitted in Commission Paper **I.C.(48)11**); (b) that words should also be inserted in the provision to be inserted in Article 25 to give effect to the decision embodied in *Opinion* 4 making it clear that it is immaterial for the purpose there in question whether an author, when publishing a manuscript name or republishing with an indication, including the citation of such a name in the synonymy of a species having a validly published name, a name previously published as a *nomen nudum*, expressly states that he is so doing or whether an author when

publishing or, as the case may be, republishing such a name, attributes that name to some other author in the erroneous belief that the name in question had been duly published by that author; (c) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in Article 25 strongly condemning the practice of publishing manuscript names or republishing names previously given an irregular currency through their having appeared in print as *nomina nuda* and urging any author who may feel that for some special reason it is important that such a name should be published or, as the case may be, republished, expressly to draw attention to the nature of the action which he is taking.

THE SECTION agreed that their conclusions on the foregoing matters should be treated as having been covered in the approval already given by the Section to the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress.

Authorship of new names and method to be adopted in citing authors' names : supplementary provisions

5. THE SECTION participated in a discussion raised by the Acting President of the Commission in regard to the method to be adopted in citing the authorship of a name which was published in a joint paper by two or more authors, but where it was clearly stated in the paper that the description of the new taxonomic unit concerned was the exclusive work of one of the authors concerned. It was explained that this matter had been included by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) in one of the proposals which he had submitted for consideration, but which had been postponed when, on the previous Thursday (22nd July, 1948), the Commission had considered those applications. The proposal was that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that, where a paper written jointly by two authors (authors "A" and "B") contains clear evidence that the description of some or all of the newly named taxonomic units is the exclusive work of one of the authors (say, author "B"), that name is to be attributed to "B" and cited as having been published by "'B' *in* 'A' and 'B'." Similarly, if an author ("A") includes in a paper a new name, and it is there expressly stated that the description of the taxonomic unit so named was written by some other author (say, author "C"), that name should be attributed to author "C" and cited as having been published by "'C' *in* 'A'."

THE SECTION approved the recommendations submitted by the Commission and agreed that their approval thereof should be treated as having been covered by the approval already given by the Section to the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress.

Approval of certain recommendations embodied in notes attached to re-issues of old *Opinions* or as appendices to new *Opinions*

6. THE SECTION participated in a review by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of recommendations on certain matters submitted by the Secretary to the Commission, either in the re-issues of old *Opinions* or when issuing for the first time *Opinions* recently adopted by the Commission. The recommendations in question were :—(1) that an *Opinion* should be rendered stating that the names in the Nozeman & Vosmaer edition of Moehring's *Genera Avium* possessed no availability under Article 25, the book in question being no more than a re-publication, after the close of 1757, of names published before 1758, which, on being so republished, were not re-inforced by adoption or acceptance on the part of the authors by whom it was republished (see footnote 10 to the re-issue of *Opinion* 5) ; (2) that *Opinions* should be rendered, as proposed in Note 8 to the re-issue of *Opinion* 13, dealing with (a) the status of names published in the Edwards edition of Catesby, 1771, *Natural History of Carolina*, (b) the status of Meuschen, 1778, *Museum Gronovianum*, and (c) the specific name of the Sand Crab (an *Opinion* to replace *Opinion* 13, now to be cancelled) ; (3) the determination of the status and type species of certain generic names discussed in *Opinion* 16 ; (4) the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Taenia solium* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Taenia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Cestoidea), thereby giving valid force to the erroneous entry in regard to this generic name made by the decision embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 84 (proposal submitted in Note 7 to the re-issue of *Opinion* 16); (5) a recommendation submitted in an Appendix to *Opinion* 166 on the subject of the status of the name *Pompilus* and seven other names commonly, but erroneously, treated as having been published as generic names by Schneider (J.G.) in 1784, *Sammlung vermischter Abhandlungen zur Aufklärung der Zoologie und der Handlungsgeschichte* and the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Octopodia* Schneider, 1784, and validate the name *Octopus* Lamarck, 1784 (Class Cephalopoda) and matters incidental thereto.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the decisions taken by the Commission in regard to the foregoing proposals.

Re-issue of the older of the *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : arrangements for

7. THE SECTION participated in a discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the subject of the re-issue of the older of the *Opinions* which were now out of print and so scarce in Europe as to be virtually unobtainable. In the course of this discussion, the Commission agreed that, in view of the change

in the situation created by the decision to codify the *Règles* by incorporating either in the *Règles* themselves or in the Schedules thereto all the decisions recorded in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, save in those cases where it had been decided that a particular decision or part of a decision should not be so codified, there was no longer any need for the publication of fully edited re-issues of the old *Opinions* but that, in view of the importance of those *Opinions* and their great scarcity, especially in Europe, it was desirable that the full text of those *Opinions* should be made available by their being re-published in facsimile.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the decision taken by the Commission in this matter.

Nomenclature of the human malaria parasites

8. THE SECTION participated in a discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the question of the nomenclature of the human malaria parasites. The Commission had attempted to deal with this matter in 1928 when in *Opinion* 104 they had directed that the generic names *Plasmodium* and *Laverania* should be placed on the "Official List," with the "Quartan Malaria Parasite" as the type species of the first of these genera and the "Malignant Tertian" ("Aestivo-Autumnal") Malaria Parasite as the type species of the second. The object sought by the Commission when taking this action, namely the grant of official recognition to the universal usage of malariologists was obviously right, but unfortunately the data relating to these generic names and their respective type species given in *Opinion* 104 were incorrect in almost every possible particular. The whole subject was extremely involved and had been studied independently on the one hand by Commissioner Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission, in the course of editing the "Official List" for publication, and on the other hand by Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) and Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (U.S.A.). It was satisfactory to be able to note that both sets of investigators had reached similar conclusions in regard to the action which should be taken to regularise the position in regard to these important names. In the course of the discussion of the names which had at various times been applied to these species, attention was drawn to the fact that in the last decade of the XIXth century several authors who had regarded all these species as forms of a single species had applied to them Latin adjectives in the genitive case in grammatical agreement, not with the generic name as required by Article 14, but with the specific trivial name, expressed or understood. It was generally agreed that it would be wrong for the

provisions relating to the automatic correction of names formed in contravention of Article 14 and other Articles which had been agreed upon by the Section at an earlier meeting to apply to cases such as those referred to above. The Commission accordingly agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the foregoing provisions did not apply in the class of case here under consideration and therefore that adjectives so published had no standing as trivial names.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the action which the Commission decided to take under their plenary powers to validate and clarify the entries in the "Official List" in regard to the generic names discussed above. The Section approved also the proposal submitted in relation to Article 14.

"Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology": supplementary decisions regarding

9. THE SECTION participated in a discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on certain matters relating to the rules agreed to be laid down in regard to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." In this connection it was pointed out that, although this "Official List" had been established for recording the trivial names of species, it would inevitably happen on occasion that the Commission would wish to inscribe on this "List" trivial names which, although now currently regarded as specific trivial names, had originally been published as subspecific trivial names. Quite apart from such cases, it might sometimes be considered desirable to place on this "List" trivial names which all were agreed should be regarded as subspecific trivial names. Again, cases might arise where there was general agreement that it was desirable that a given trival name should be placed on the "List" but where specialists were not agreed as to whether the trivial name in question should be regarded as a specific, or as a subspecific, trivial name. It was considered that in such cases the best course would be to follow the precedent set in regard to generic names (on the suggestion of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán) under which more than one generic name was placed on the "Official List" in cases where it was agreed that it was desirable that the generic nomenclature of a given group should be stabilised, but where there was not agreement as to whether more than one genus was involved. In such cases both generic names were placed on the "Official List," a note being attached to the later published generic name making it clear that it was placed on the "Official List" solely for the benefit of those workers who considered that more than one genus was involved. At the close of the discussion the

Commission agreed to submit recommendations in the foregoing sense to the Section for approval.

THE SECTION approved the recommendation submitted by the International Commission that the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* in regard to the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " should be expanded in the manner indicated above. At the same time the Section took note of, and concurred in, the conclusion reached by the Commission that the foregoing extension of the scope of this " Official List " did not call for any change in its title.

Editorial Committee charged with the duty of editing the revised text of the "*Règles*": composition of

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Minute 5*)

10. THE SECTION, jointly with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, then turned to consider the composition of the Editorial Committee of Three Members which, at the first of the meetings held that day, the Section had agreed should be entrusted with the duty of examining and determining any questions which might be raised as the result of the examination by the members of the Commission of the draft prepared by the jurists, of the *Règles*, as revised by the present Congress.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that, in accordance with the request addressed to him at the joint meeting of the Section and the Commission held that morning, he had held consultations during the day with leading European and American zoologists on the question of the proposals to be submitted to the Section in regard to the selection of the zoologists to be invited to serve on the Editorial Committee. There was general agreement that the membership of this Committee should consist of the Secretary to the Commission and of one European, and one American member of the Commission. For the European seat, all were agreed that it was desirable to secure the services of a zoologist, whose mother tongue was French but who was also thoroughly familiar with the English language, for this qualification would be of especial value in ensuring the closest comparison of the draft of the substantive French text of the *Règles* with the draft of the English translation of that text. The unanimous view of all the zoologists consulted was that this place should be offered to Professor V. van Straelen who had not only played an important part, as an Alternate Member of the Commission, in the reform of the *Règles* agreed upon during the present Congress and possessed in an outstanding measure the special qualifications required but was also a zoologist of the highest distinction whose appointment to the Editorial Committee would be generally

acclaimed by European zoologists. Professor van Straelen was unfortunately detained by another engagement elsewhere but he had authorised him (the President) to state that, if it was the general wish of the Commission and the Section that he should serve on the Editorial Committee, he would be willing to do so. For the American seat on the Committee, the Americal zoologists consulted would have desired to nominate Professor J. Chester Bradley, the senior of the American members of the Commission attending the present Congress, but they realised that this was not practicable, in view of the arrangements made by Professor Chester Bradley to start an extensive tour of Africa shortly after the close of the Congress. The American zoologists accordingly proposed that the American seat on the Editorial Committee should be offered to Professor Robert L. Usinger, who, as an Alternate Member of the Commission, had attended all the meetings of the Commission and the Section at which the reform of the *Règles* had been under consideration and had himself played an outstanding part in the discussions leading to the decisions reached. Professor Usinger had indicated that, if so invited by the Commission and the Section, he would be willing to serve on the Editorial Committee.

In the discussion which ensued, general satisfaction was expressed on behalf both of the Commission and of the Section at the result of the discussions undertaken by the President, the nominations suggested meeting with the approval of all present.

After the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had unanimously agreed to recommend the adoption of the nominations suggested, THE SECTION agreed that the Editorial Committee should be composed of Mr. Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, Professor V. van Straelen and Professor Robert L. Usinger.

Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion of a reference to the composition of the Editorial Committee and other matters

11. At the close of the discussion recorded in the preceding minute, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature intimated that, now that the composition of the Editorial Committee had been settled, they desired to insert a reference to this subject in their Report to the Congress. The Commission felt sure that this would be in accordance with the wish of the Section and they accordingly sought the concurrence of the Section in the action proposed. The Commission desired also that the Section should signify that the approval given to conclusions reached by the Commission as regards both items affecting the *Règles* and individual nomenclatorial questions, at the

present meeting, was to be taken as being indicated also in the approval given that morning to the Report submitted by the Commission.

THE SECTION approved the proposal of the International Commission that their Report to the Congress should be modified so as to include a reference to the composition of the Editorial Committee and should be held to cover also the matters dealt with at the present meeting, to which the Section had signified their approval.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: internal procedure during inter-Congress periods

12. THE SECTION participated in a discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the possibility of improving the existing arrangements for the maintenance, during inter-Congress periods, of close contact between the Secretary and other members of the Commission in regard to the work of the Commission.

THE SECTION took note of the arrangements agreed upon by the International Commission in regard to the above matter.

Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Paris Session: arrangements for securing an agreed text

13. THE SECTION participated in a discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the arrangements to be made for securing agreement among the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners who had attended the Paris Session, in regard to the text of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at that Session. At the close of this discussion, the Commission agreed that, in view of the inevitably bulky character of the Official Record, the draft should be printed as soon as it was available, and it should be submitted to the Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners concerned in proof form, airmail being used for all destinations outside the United Kingdom. It was further agreed that a period of one month should be allowed for the return of comments on the draft and that on the completion of the foregoing period, the text of the Official Record should be settled by the Secretary in the light of any comments that might have been received and thereupon published with the least possible delay in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " in conformity with the decision already taken by the Section on Nomenclature.

THE SECTION took note of the arrangements agreed upon by the International Commission in regard to the above matter.

Thanks of the Section on Nomenclature to the members of the

14. THE SECTION heartily endorsed a proposal submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that their thanks be given to those members

Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

of the Congress who had served as Alternate Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(*At this point Professor J. Chester Bradley rose in his place and said that he had a proposal which he desired to bring before the Section regarding the services rendered by Mr. Francis Hemming in the discharge of his duties as President of the Section on Nomenclature during the present Congress.*)

(*In accordance with Professor Chester Bradley's request, Mr. Francis Hemming then vacated the Presidential Chair, which, on the invitation of the Section, was thereupon taken by Professor Harold Kirby* (*U.S.A.*)).

Rising Vote of Thanks to Mr. Francis Hemming for his conduct of the Office of President of the Section on Nomenclature

15. PROFESSOR J. CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) said that it would be the wish of the members of the Section, including also all those members of the Congress who had attended earlier meetings of the Section but had been unable to be present at this evening's meeting, to place on record their admiration of the manner in which their President, Mr. Francis Hemming, had discharged his duties as the Presiding Officer at their meetings, combining those duties, as he had, with his heavy duties as Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and Acting President of the Commission. He was speaking for all members of the Section in conveying to Mr. Hemming their grateful thanks for the immense amount of time and effort which both before and during the Congress he had given to secure that the work of the Section on Nomenclature should be as fruitful as possible. Mr. Hemming's work as the Secretary to the International Commission was well known to every zoologist who was interested in questions of zoological nomenclature. Everyone who knew Mr. Hemming knew also his outstanding capacity for hard work and admired the energy and enthusiasm which he brought to his often difficult task. It would be the wish also of the Section, in giving their thanks to Mr. Hemming, to join with his name that of his wife, who, as they knew, combined with her duties as a wife those of a highly skilled and indefatigable personal assistant.

Professor Chester Bradley therefore proposed that the Section on Nomenclature should record their appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Hemming in his capacity as their President by giving him a rising vote of thanks and that, in doing so, they should ask him to convey to Mrs. Hemming their thanks also for the work which she had done to help to make the work of the Section a success.

Thereupon, without question put, all the members of the Section on Nomenclature rose in their places and gave Mr. Hemming a Rising Vote of Thanks for the service which he had rendered as their President, at the same time associating themselves with the tribute paid to him on their behalf by Professor Chester Bradley and asking him to convey their thanks also to Mrs. Hemming.

MR. FRANCIS HEMMING said that he desired to express his gratitude for the rising vote of thanks which the Section had just been good enough to give for his work as their President, and in particular to thank Professor Chester Bradley for the flattering terms in which he had made his proposal to the Section. The duties of the President of the Section on Nomenclature were highly responsible at any meeting of the Congress, for it fell to him so to discharge his Office as to ensure a full opportunity to every member of the Congress to express his views on questions brought before the Section, while at the same time securing also that the whole programme of the Section should be duly completed in the limited time available. At the present Congress these duties had been particularly onerous, both because of the long interval of thirteen years which had elapsed since its last meeting and because of the large number and important character of the proposals submitted to the Section by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. That the Section had been successful in completing their consideration of all the questions brought before them was due mainly to the whole-hearted spirit in which they addressed themselves to their task, to the co-operative spirit shown from the outset by all the members of the Section, and to the ready willingness which they had evinced to bring hard work, and to devote long hours, to the service of the Section. All had been inspired to do everything in their power to contribute to the common goal and it was this spirit which had made it possible for the Section to reach all its decisions by unanimity and to achieve the large measure of definite progress in the development of zoological nomenclature, for which the present Congress would always be remembered.

Mr. Hemming added that he had been much touched and greatly gratified at the reference which had been made to the great help rendered to him by his wife. He would gladly convey to her the message which had been entrusted to him by the Section. He was very happy to have this opportunity himself to pay tribute to the constant help and encouragement given to him by his wife.

(*At this point Professor Harold Kirby left the Presidential Chair which was resumed by Mr. Francis Hemming.*)

Vote of Thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress and to the Authorities of the Congress generally

16. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he felt sure that, before they dispersed, the members of the Section would wish to express their thanks to the Secretary-General of the Congress for the admirable arrangements which he had made for their meetings. They would wish at the same time to record their gratitude to their French hosts at the Congress for the arrangements made for their entertainment and for the hospitality extended to them during their visit to Paris. This had made the Congress not only of outstanding importance in the scientific field but also the occasion for the happiest memories for all who had attended it.

Close of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948

17. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the Section had now completed the whole of its business and it only remained for him once more to thank the Section for the kindness which they had throughout shown to him in the discharge of his duties as their President.

THE PRESIDENT then pronounced the Paris Session of the Section on Nomenclature to be closed.

PART 2

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT ITS FINAL PLENARY SESSION HELD IN PARIS ON 27TH JULY, 1948

(Extracts relating to zoological nomenclature)

EXTRAITS DE LA SÉANCE DE CLÔTURE

. . . Puis, M. F. Hemming rend compte des travaux de la section de Nomenclature. L'assemblée approuve les decisions de cette section, qui, de ce fait, deviennent applicables. On en trouvera le texte à la fin du volume (section 10).

Le Président donne ensuite la parole à M. F. HEMMING.

M. HEMMING, au nom de la Commission de Nomenclature, présente le voeu suivant pour être soumis à l'approbation du Congrès :—

" The International Congress of Zoology assembled in Paris in July, 1948, desires at this, its final plenary session, to place on record its conviction that the progress of taxonomic work in zoology is dependent upon a sound international system of zoological nomenclature, and accordingly records its opinion that the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is of the highest importance and deserves all possible support.

" The Congress resolves also that a copy of this resolution be communicated to UNESCO as the Resolution of the Congress."

" Le Congrès international de Zoologie réuni à Paris en séance plénière le 27 juillet 1948, désire manifester l'importance qu'il attache au progrès des recherches taxonomiques en zoologie. La taxonomie doit s'appuyer sur un système de nomenclature rationnel. En conséquence, le Congrès estime que la travail de là Commission internationale de nomenclature zoologique est du plus grand intérrêt et que ses travaux doivent recevoir le plus grand appui.

" Le Congrès décide de transmettre cette résolution a l'UNESCO."

La résolution présentée par M. HEMMING est adoptée.

PART 3

REPORTS SUBMITTED

BY THE

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

AND BY THE

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL

NOMENCLATURE

TO THE

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

OF ZOOLOGY

AT ITS

FINAL PLENARY SESSION

HELD IN

PARIS ON 27TH JULY, 1948

REPORT

BY

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

TO

THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

Introductory

We, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, assembled in Paris in July, 1948, have the honour to submit to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology the following Report in which we deal both with the developments which have occurred in the work of the Commission since our last meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 during the Twelfth International Congress and with the decisions of outstanding importance which have been reached during the present Congress by the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature.

2. The present Report is divided into three parts. In the first of these parts we deal with changes which have occurred in the composition of the Commission since 1935 and we ask for the covering approval of the Congress for the measures taken on our behalf by the Executive Committee during and since the war to secure the continued existence of the Commission as a body. In the same section we submit important proposals which we have agreed upon during the present Congress for the introduction of certain changes in the composition of the Commission and the method to be followed in electing zoologists to be members of the Commission, together with consequential changes which we are agreed it is necessary should be introduced into our procedure. The combined effect of these changes will, we are confident, secure to the Commission an unassailably representative and international character which will greatly heighten its moral authority as the body which has been entrusted by the Congress with final authority for all matters relating to the regulation of international law in the field of zoological nomenclature.

3. In Part 2 of our Report we indicate very briefly the administrative and financial developments which have marked the period since the close of the Lisbon Congress 13 years ago. It is not possible within the compass of the present Report adequately to deal with the many important innovations introduced during this period. We have therefore thought it valuable to submit with the present Report a detailed Report which has been prepared by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

4. In Part 3 of the present Report we turn to the position of the *Règles Internationales* and indicate in broad outline the far-reaching reforms which we now recommend should be introduced. These proposals are based upon extensive consultations with representative zoological institutions and with leading specialists in many groups, both in the Old World and the New. The plan now submitted constitutes by far the most extensive and significant contribution to the advancement of zoological nomenclature since the adoption of the *Règles* at the meeting of the Congress held in Berlin in 1901. The successful issue of our discussions at the present Congress is due very largely to the great interest displayed in matters of nomenclature by many members of the present Congress and to the scientific and objective spirit which they have brought to the discussion of the many complex problems involved. To a considerable extent also this happy result is due to the decision of the Commission to throw its meetings open to all members of the Congress, thereby enlisting at every stage the accumulated knowledge and experience of a wide range of specialists in many fields. The Commission desire to thank all those who participated in their meetings for the valuable assistance and advice which they brought to the elaboration of the present plan.

5. The changes now proposed will enormously simplify the task of zoologists in applying the *Règles* in the course of their special studies and as such will be warmly welcomed by them. Everything in the *Règles* which experience has shown to be wisely conceived and of permanent value has been most carefully conserved. On the other hand, everything which is time-worn or obscure has been placed on one side and replaced by provisions which are clear, definite and explicit. The provisions agreed upon by the Commission which are now submitted for the approval of the Congress are designed to meet the expressed views of leading zoologists in all parts of the world and to further the attainment of that stability in nomenclature which it is the aim of every zoologist to secure.

6. In addition, during the last four of the 14 meetings which we have held during the present Congress, we have reached decisions on a large number of applications received from specialists on individual problems of zoological nomenclature. The decisions so reached will be embodied in *Opinions* as rapidly as circumstances permit.

PART 1

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION DURING THE PERIOD 1935-1948, AND PROPOSALS DESIGNED TO SECURE FOR THE COMMISSION THE MOST TRULY REPRESENTATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER AND TO ENDOW THAT BODY WITH THE HIGHEST MEASURE OF MORAL AUTHORITY.

(a) Changes in the composition of the Commission since 1935.

7. *Losses through death and resignation.*—Deaths and resignations through ill-health have, as was to be expected, led to heavy losses in the membership of the Commission since its meeting held at Lisbon 13 years ago.

8. We have lost through death no less than seven of our colleagues, Commissioners Fantham, Stone, Stiles, Stejneger, Chapman, Arndt and Pellegrin. Every one of the colleagues whom we have lost made a valuable contribution to the work of the Commission during his period of office, and we deeply regret—as we do not doubt the Congress will also regret—that they should have passed from among us. We feel bound to express a particular sense of loss arising from the death of our Vice-President, Commissioner Charles Wardell Stiles (U.S.A.), who at the time of his death had served continuously as a member of the Commission for 45 years, during 38 of which he had held the office of Secretary, and of Commissioner Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.) who served as a member of the Commission for 44 years, and by his wide experience and judicial temperament had made a most notable contribution to the work of the Commission.

9. We feel bound also to express our particular regret at the death of Commissioner Walther Arndt (Germany) who lost his life during the war in circumstances which constitute an ineffaceable outrage against the whole body of men of science. Denounced to the Gestapo apparently for no other reason than his intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between scientific men, irrespective of nationality, Commissioner Arndt, the most gentle and inoffensive of men, was hurriedly arrested in January, 1944, and shortly afterwards suffered death by the headsman's axe. We deeply deplore the loss which we have sustained as the result of this abominable crime and we ask the Congress to join with us in emphatically condemning this disgraceful murder.

10. In addition we have lost four other Commissioners through other causes Three Commissioners (Apstein, Silvestri, Bolivar) have resigned on account of advancing years and ill-health or for other reasons, while Commissioner Jacjewski (Poland) has been unable to continue to discharge his duties as a Commissioner as the result of circumstances arising out of the late war, and his place has accordingly been treated as having been vacated.

11. *Election of Commissioner Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission.*—At the close of the Lisbon Congress in 1935 the post of Secretary to the Commission was vacant, Commissioner C. W. Stiles having resigned that office but no election of a successor having been made. A year later, in October, 1936, Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) was unanimously elected to be Secretary to the Commission and the headquarters of the Commission were accordingly transferred from Washington to London.

12. *Steps taken to fill vacancies.*—In accordance with the powers conferred on them by the Congress at their meeting held at Monaco in 1913, the Commission have taken the following steps to fill the vacancies which have arisen in their body and they ask for the approval of the Congress for the action so taken :—

(1) *Elections in* 1937.

Senhor A. do Amaral (Brazil) *vice* Dr. A. Handlirsch (Austria). Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) *vice* Dr. Geza Horváth (Hungary). Dr. Walther Arndt (Germany) *vice* Professor Karl Apstein (Germany).

(2) *Elections in* 1939.

Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) *vice* Professor F. Silvestri (Italy). Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) *vice* Dr. H. B. Fantham (Canada). Dr. T. Jacjewski (Poland) *vice* Dr. C. Bolivar y Pieltain.

(3) *Elections during the war.*

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Witmer Stone (U.S.A.). Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.). Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.). Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) *vice* Dr. Frederick Chapman (Australia).

(4) *Elections since the end of the war.*

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) *vice* Dr. W. Arndt (Germany). Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) *vice* Professor Jacques Pellegrin (France). Dr. Paul Rode (France) *vice* Dr. T. Jacjewski (Poland).

13. We ask the Congress to approve and confirm the elections set forth above.

14. At the same time we have to report that, in accordance with the powers delegated to us by the Congress, we took steps, as each of the Classes of which the body of the Commission is composed completed its term of service, to replace it with a new Class and to elect to that Class the retiring members of the time-expired Class. The Classes so constituted were: Class 1946 *vice* Class 1937: Class 1949 *vice* Class 1940: Class 1952 *vice* Class 1943: Class 1955 *vice* Class 1946. We ask the Congress to approve and confirm the action so taken.

15. *German and Japanese representation on the Commission.*—At our present meeting we have reviewed the action taken in this matter as respects two Commissioners, namely Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) and Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany). We have a high regard for the professional eminence of both of these colleagues and value the important services which they have rendered to the Commission during their term of office. We feel, however, that, in the circumstances arising out of the late war, we should be correctly reflecting the general sentiment of zoologists as a whole in recommending that the zoologists of Japan and Germany respectively should now be given an opportunity of deciding for themselves whether their present representation should remain unchanged or whether it would be their wish to nominate other zoologists to represent them. We accordingly recommend to the Congress that they should release Professor Esaki and Professor Richter from service as members of the Commission and should declare their places to be rendered vacant.

16. *Re-election of the Officers of the Commission during the war.*—We have also to report that on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1940, the offices of President and Secretary fell vacant owing to the completion of their terms of service of Commissioners Karl Jordan and Francis Hemming, while three years later the office of Vice-President similarly fell vacant consequent upon the completion of the term of service of Class 1943 of which Commissioner James Lee Peters was a member. In each case we invited the retiring officer to

resume his functions for a further period, being convinced that this would be in accordance with the wishes of the Congress. We ask that our action in this matter be approved and confirmed.

17. *Attendance of Commissioners at present meeting.*—Five members of the Commission have attended the present Session of meetings: namely Commissioners Hemming, di Caporiacco, Bradley, Boschma and Rode. The remaining members, including our President and Vice-President, were unavoidably prevented from being present. In the absence of the President and Vice-President, our meetings during the present session have been presided over by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

18. *Election of Alternate Members of the Commission for the duration of the Congress.*—In accordance with the power conferred upon the Commission by the Congress at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927, we invited the undermentioned members of the Congress to serve as Alternate Members of the Commission during our present Paris Session :—

Senor Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Señor A. Cabrera (Argentina)
Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)
Professor Arturo Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Senhor A. do Amaral (Brazil)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.)
Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt) *vice* Professor Béla Hankó (Hungary)
Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)
Mr. Norman D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Dr. W. T. Calman (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) *vice* Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark)
Professor V. von Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.)

19. We desire to express our sense of indebtedness to the foregoing zoologists for consenting to assist us by serving as Alternate Members of the Commission and for the long hours which many of them have devoted to our proceedings, often at considerable personal inconvenience and always at the cost of not participating in other activities of the Congress.

20. *Proposed abandonment of the system of Classes in the Membership of the Commission and the adoption of an alternative arrangement to secure that members of the Commission shall periodically submit themselves to re-election.*—The system by which the membership of the Commission is divided into three nine-year Classes was adopted by the Congress at its Sixth Meeting held at Berne in 1904 with the object of securing that members of the Commission should submit themselves periodically to re-election. We are in full agreement with the object of the Congress in this matter, but we are of the opinion that the system of nine-year Classes has outlived its usefulness, for, owing to the fact that the Congress no longer meets regularly at three-yearly intervals, this system fails to secure that one of the three Classes shall automatically complete its term of service in each year in which the Congress is held. We accordingly recommend that the system of Classes in the membership of the Commission should now be abandoned and that in its place there should be adopted a system under which the names of the members of the Commission shall be arranged in the order in which the Commissioners concerned were elected or, in the case of

Commissioners who have served more than one term of service, were last re-elected and that at each meeting of the Congress one-third of the total membership of the Commission shall be deemed to have completed its term of service, the Commissioners so to vacate their positions being those having served the longest since their election or, as the case may be, their last re-election to be members of the Commission. We propose that the existing rule under which a retiring Commissioner is eligible for immediate re-election shall be maintained.

21. *Completion of the term of service of five members of the Commission, the proposed re-election of four of the retiring Commissioners and the nomination of a member of the Congress to fill the fifth of the vacancies so created.*—Under the system hitherto in force, the Class 1949 would have been deemed to have completed its term of service at the close of the present Congress, the members of that Class would have vacated their positions as Commissioners and a new Class, the Class 1958, would have been constituted in the place of the Class 1949. For the reasons explained in the preceding paragraph, we do not recommend that a Class 1958 should now be constituted. In order, however, to maintain the practice by which a part of the membership of the Commission completes its term of service at the end of each meeting of the Congress, we propose that those Commissioners who at present belong to the Class 1949 should be deemed to have completed their term of service on the close of the present Congress and that the vacancies so created shall be filled under the system recommended in paragraph 20 above. The members of the Commission whose service as such will terminate under the present proposal are Commissioners Cabrera, Hemming, Jordan, Mortensen, Pearson. Of the retiring Commissioners, we recommend that Señor Cabrera, Mr. Hemming, Dr. Jordan, and Dr. Pearson should be immediately re-elected to be members of the Commission. We should certainly have recommended the re-election also of our old friend and colleague Dr. Th. Mortensen if it had not been for the fact that he has asked to be released from service as a Commissioner on account of ill-health. We have felt bound to respect Dr. Mortensen's wishes in this matter, and, after consultation with the Danish zoologists present at the Congress, we recommend that the place vacated by Dr. Mortensen should be assigned to Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark), who has acted as an Alternate Member of the Commission during our present Session and has played an active and valuable part in our discussions.

22. *Resignation of President Karl Jordan.*—It is with the deepest regret and with a profound sense of loss that we have received a letter from our President, Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom), expressing the hope that, having regard to his age and to the fact that he is now totally deaf, he may be released from the duties of President of the Commission. Dr. Jordan has been a Member of the Commission continuously for a period of 35 years during 19 of which he held the office of President, having been elected thereto in 1929, consequent upon the death of the eminent Italian zoologist, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. Throughout his long term of office, Dr. Jordan has brought to the service of the Commission a wealth of knowledge, a wisdom of counsel, and a high sense of judicial impartiality which has been of the greatest value to the Commission. In particular, the Commission owe to Dr. Jordan a special debt of gratitude for the devotion which he has brought to his duties as our

President and to the judgment with which he has guided our labours during many difficult periods. We sincerely regret that Dr. Jordan has found it necessary to take the present decision and we thank him most warmly for the eminent services which, while President of the Commission, he has rendered to zoological nomenclature. Our regret would be all the keener were it not for the fact that Dr. Jordan has felt able to accede to our request that, although no longer our President, he should continue to serve as a member of our body. We feel that it will be the unanimous wish of the Congress, as it is of the Commission, that a special tribute should be paid to our old friend and colleague and we have therefore great pleasure in recommending the Congress, as an exceptional measure, to establish the post of Honorary Life President of the Commission and to offer this post to our retiring President.

23. *Proposed election of Vice-President James Lee Peters to be President.*—We unanimously recommend that our Vice-President, Dr. James Lee Peters (U.S.A.), be elected President of the Commission in succession to Dr. Karl Jordan. Dr. Peters is well known not only to us but also to a wide body of zoologists and we feel confident that in his hands the impartiality and dignity of the Presidency of the Commission will be upheld and maintained.

24. *Proposed election of Commissioner A. do Amaral to be Vice-President of the Commission.*—We have pleasure in recommending that the vacancy caused by the election of Dr. Peters to be President should be filled by the election of Dr. A. do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President of the Commission.

25. *Proposed re-election of Commissioner Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission.*—The term of office of Commissioner Francis Hemming as Secretary to the Commission expires on the last day of the present Congress consequent on the expiry of the period of service of the Class 1949. We recommend that Commissioner Hemming should be re-elected to this office for a further period.

26. *Office of Assistant Secretary.*—We recommend that this office should be allowed to lapse as an office to be held by a member of the Commission and should be made available for the chief Assistant to the Secretary in the Bureau of the Commission.

(b) Proposed enlargement of the Commission and introduction of changes in the manner of nominating members of the Commission.

27. We recommend that, in order to provide an opportunity for any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work is being done to be represented or for the election of any zoologist of outstanding qualities who would be pre-eminently suitable to be a member of the Commission, the membership of the Commission should be enlarged, there being in future no upper limit to the number of members, the present number of 18 being retained as a minimum. We propose also that certain safeguards should be introduced to secure that there shall at all times be an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission as between different parts of the world and as between different types of knowledge and experience both in the field of systematic zoology (including palæozoology) and in those of the applied sciences which are concerned with organisms belonging to the Animal Kingdom.

28. We recommend also that certain changes should be made in the manner by which zoologists may be proposed for election as members of the Commission. We think it necessary that the Commission should retain the right and the duty of itself inviting individual zoologists in certain cases to serve as members of the Commission, but we consider also that, parallel with this method of selection, there should be introduced a system by which the views of zoologists in any particular country should be sought, through appropriate channels, in regard to the selection of a zoologist of their country to be their national representative on the Commission.

29. We have discussed both these proposals at a meeting held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature which is in full agreement with the line of development which we advocate. We do not consider it necessary, therefore, to set out here the detailed machinery by which we propose that the new scheme should be operated, for we feel that it will be the wish of the Congress that matters of this kind should be settled in the Section on Nomenclature and that only the broad outlines of the scheme should be brought to the attention of the Congress in plenary Session. Full particulars of both schemes will, however, be recorded in the minutes both of the Commission and of the Section for purposes of record.

30. We ask for the approval of the Congress for the proposed enlargement of the Commission and for the changes in the method to be followed in the election of members of the Commission outlined above.

(c) The procedure of the Commission.

31. In consequence of the recommendations for the enlargement of the Commission submitted in the preceding paragraph, changes are needed in the procedure of the Commission. Further, even if no change had been proposed in the size of the Commission, we should have felt bound to ask the Congress to withdraw the rule by which in certain types of case absolute unanimity is required at present, for experience has shown that the *Liberum Veto* is a definite hindrance to the work of the Commission and is open to strong objection, quite apart from the objections generally entertained towards this outworn rule of voting. The Commission consider, however, that as regards cases involving either the suspension of the *Règles* or a proposed amendment to the *Règles* a more rigorous rule of voting should be required than should be necessary to secure the approval of the Commission on other matters. In their present proposals, therefore, the Commission have made provision for a distinction of this kind, the more rigorous of the two standards requiring (1) that as a minimum one-quarter of the membership of the Commission shall record their votes, and (2) that two out of every three votes cast shall be in favour of the action proposed.

32. We have discussed our proposals in detail with the Section on Nomenclature by whom they are approved and supported. Full particulars will be given in the minutes of the meetings both of the Commission and of the Section. We believe that in view of the heavy calls upon its time the Congress will regard the foregoing summary as adequate for their purposes and we accordingly invite the Congress to give their approval to the plan for the reform of the Commission's procedure proposed by the Commission and unanimously approved by the Section on Nomenclature.

33. We should add that we have decided also upon various administrative reforms which will, we believe, greatly reduce the period required to obtain an *Opinion* from the Commission on any given question of nomenclature and thus materially enhance the value to zoologists of the work of the Commission.

PART 2

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS DURING THE PERIOD 1936-1948.

34. The detailed Report prepared by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming, which, as already explained (paragraph 3 above), we propose to lay before the Congress, gives a full account of the administrative and financial developments which have occurred in the work of the Commission during the period from October, 1936 (when Commissioner Hemming was elected to be Secretary to the Commission), up to the opening of the present Congress. It will be sufficient, therefore, if here we confine ourselves to the briefest outline of these developments. We think it necessary, however, to include this short summary, partly because the Congress is entitled to be informed of the work of the Commission during the long interval which has elapsed since its last meeting and partly because we wish to take the opportunity of expressing our concurrence in the various developments in question and of securing the approval of the Congress for the action taken.

35. The principal developments which we have to report are as follows :—

(1) A critical situation arose immediately upon the transfer of the Secretariat of the Commission to London, since at that time the Commission possessed no funds at all and was naturally unable to look for the assistance which, while located in Washington, it had received from the Smithsonian Institution. At the outset, therefore, it was necessary to raise a small fund from leading scientific institutions in the United Kingdom and the United States.

(2) By June, 1939, the Secretariat had been firmly established at its new headquarters and the publication of *Opinions* directly by the Commission itself began in August of that year.

(3) The outbreak of war in September, 1939, put a temporary stop to the work of the Commission, as, owing to the threat of air raids on London, it was thought best to evacuate the records of the Commission to a place of safety in the country. In the summer of 1942 these were brought back to London and the work of the Secretariat was resumed.

(4) No new nomenclatorial decisions could be taken during the war owing to the interruption of all communications between the Secretariat in London and those members of the Commission who were nationals of Germany and the countries associated with her and also with those members of the Commission who were nationals of countries then in

German occupation. There was, however, at that time a large number of applications on which decisions had already been taken and also a certain number on which every Commissioner had had an opportunity of voting but on which the voting had not been completed. It was accordingly decided first to prepare and publish *Opinions* on all the cases falling in the first of these classes and second to secure enough additional votes from the available Commissioners to complete the cases that were still incomplete.

(5) The publication of *Opinions* was re-started in October, 1942, and continued steadily until all the decisions taken at Lisbon had been formally rendered by the issue of 48 *Opinions* and three *Declarations*. In addition, during the same period 13 *Opinions* were completed and published and *Declarations* 1 to 9 and *Opinions* 1 to 16 were republished, the earlier edition having become out of print. The titles of all these publications are given in Commissioner Hemming's detailed Report. In all, three *Declarations* and 61 *Opinions* have been rendered and published since the outbreak of war, the total number rendered to date amounting to 12 *Declarations* and 194 *Opinions*.

(6) In 1943 the Commission established a journal, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, as a medium for the publication of the texts of applications submitted for decision, thereby providing an opportunity for zoologists all over the world to ascertain what proposals are before the Commission at any given time and to comment thereon before any decision is taken by the Commission.

(7) An appeal for a fund of £1,800 was issued in 1943 and a number of generous donations were received in response.

(8) Nevertheless the financial position of the Commission remained extremely precarious, even though all the work of the Secretariat was done for the Commission by an unpaid spare-time Secretary and the Secretariat itself was housed in the Secretary's house.

(9) In 1947 UNESCO came forward with a generous offer of a conditional grant of $10,600 and a similar grant (also conditional) has been made for the current year.

(10) In 1947, also, a Corporation was formed under United Kingdom law under the title "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature," which took over from the Commission the responsibility for the conduct of its financial affairs. This was essential, for only by this means could the Commission's financial affairs be placed upon an assured basis.

36. The immediate difficulties have been relieved by the grant made by UNESCO but the central problem facing the Commission and the Congress remains unsolved. For the volume of work passing through the Secretariat of the Commission has grown so greatly that a whole-time permanent Secretary is required, it being beyond the capacity of any honorary Secretary who (like the present one) can devote only his spare time to the work of the Commission, his day time being necessarily taken up with earning a livelihood. Such an appointment cannot be made until the Commission has an assured income of $25,000 to $30,000 a year, or some two-and-a-half times as great as the grant received

from UNESCO during the past year. In the meantime the Commission must do the best it can with the help of a spare-time Secretary who by providing his services free heavily subsidises the Commission and gives it an air of financial soundness which it does not possess.

37. It is the intention of the Commission to seek additional means of financial support, for it realises how easy it would be for a situation to arise in which with its present income it would be impossible for it to continue its work. The situation is extremely difficult and is a source of constant anxiety. It will not be remedied until the leading zoological institutions of the world, realising (as they already do) that the Commission is an institution, the continued existence of which is essential for their work, take steps to provide the Commission with an assured income sufficient to enable it at least to provide the service in regard to nomenclature which is essential to all zoologists and which it alone is in a position to offer.

Part 3.

THE PROPOSED CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENT OF THE "RÈGLES"

38. At the present time the state of international law in respect to zoological nomenclature is extremely unsatisfactory, zoologists having to rely on the one hand upon the *Règles* adopted nearly 50 years ago and now in serious need of re-examination and on the other hand upon an ill-digested mass of case law built up over more than 40 years in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission.

39. Inspired by a desire to make an advance towards substituting order for the present chaos, the Commission drew up plans prior to the opening of the present Congress for the incorporation into the *Règles* of the interpretative decisions already given by the Commission in *Opinions*, for the settlement of a number of important individual nomenclatorial problems which were either not dealt with in the *Règles* or were there dealt with in a piece-meal, incoherent and obscure fashion and for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a number of long overdue minor corrections, clarifications and additions. On assembling in Paris, we quickly found that the general temper of zoologists attending the Congress was strongly in favour of a more thorough-going reform than had previously seemed practicable. Encouraged by these favourable conditions, the Commission have devoted every effort to securing the maximum benefit from the present Congress and now, after holding 14 meetings during a period of five working days, have drawn up a far-reaching but carefully balanced scheme of reform.

40. *Codification of the "Opinions" relating to the "Règles."*—We have drawn up, and the Section on Nomenclature has approved, a plan for the immediate incorporation into the *Règles* (subject to certain exceptions and modifications) of all the interpretations of various of its Articles which have been given by the Commission at different times. We recommend also the incorporation into the *Règles* of the important resolutions of a more general character, which are embodied in certain of the Commission's *Declarations*. It is part of our purpose that on their incorporation into the *Règles* the *Opinions* and *Declarations* on which the newly-incorporated provisions are based should be repealed and cancelled for all except historical purposes.

41. *The problem of the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire."*—This problem, which gave rise to such serious difficulties at Padua in 1930, was (as the Congress will recall) referred back to the Commission in 1935 by the President of the Section on Nomenclature, to whom the matter had been submitted by the *Comité Permanent*. During the present meeting we have unanimously adopted a Report in which (1) we find that the foregoing expression as at present used in the *Règles* has a meaning exactly equivalent to that of the expression "nomenclature binominale" and (2) we recommend that, subject to certain safeguards for generic names published by non-binominal authors, the expression "nomenclature binominale" should now be incorporated in the *Règles* in place of the expression "nomenclature binaire." We submitted this Report to the President of the Section on Nomenclature by whom it was laid before the Section. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that the Section gave their unanimous approval to our Report, which is accordingly submitted to the Congress for final approval.

42. *Three major problems of zoological nomenclature.*—We have submitted detailed reports to the Section on Nomenclature on three major problems of zoological nomenclature, of which the first is at present dealt with in the *Règles* in a manner contrary to the general wishes of zoologists, the second is dealt with so obscurely and incompletely that the present state of the law is open to the greatest doubt, while the third deals with a question on which the *Règles* are absolutely silent. These questions are:—

(1) the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in proviso (a) to Article 25;

(2) the rules relating to homonymy in specific and subspecific trivial names;

(3) the problem of names for forms of less than subspecific rank.

43. On our proposals for dealing with each of these important questions the Section on Nomenclature has expressed its unanimous and enthusiastic support.

44. *Miscellaneous amendments in, additions to, and clarifications of, the "Règles."*—We have submitted a large number of proposals for amending the *Règles*, for making additions thereto and for inserting clarifications in regard to passages which were either obscure or badly drafted. These proposals also have been warmly acclaimed by the Section on Nomenclature.

45. *Incorporation in the "Règles" of decisions at present embodied in "Opinions" and the consequential repeal of the "Opinions" in question.*—We propose that all decisions in regard to individual names should be incorporated in Schedules to be attached to the *Règles* and that, when this has been done, the *Opinions* in question should be repealed and cancelled except for historical purposes. In the case of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," we propose that the Schedule concerned should be issued separately as a companion volume to the actual *Règles*. The reform constituted by this plan will afford an immense relief to zoologists and naturally therefore won for itself warm support in the Section on Nomenclature.

46. "*Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.*"—In view of the very widespread wish expressed both inside and outside the Section on Nomenclature that the "Official List" should be used as a means of promoting stability in nomenclature, we agreed to recommend that the status of names on the "Official List" should be enhanced by providing that, even if a name is found to have been placed on the "List" in error, it should remain the correct name for the genus in question unless and until the Commission shall otherwise direct. In view of the enhanced status now to be given to all names on the "Official List," the Commission hope that specialists will be stimulated to co-operate actively in securing the addition to the "Official List" of all the more important generic names in the groups with which they are concerned, thereby achieving a far-reaching measure of stability in the nomenclature of the groups in question.

47. *Proposed establishment of an "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology."*—In furtherance of our general aim to promote stability in zoological nomenclature, we submitted to the Section on Nomenclature a proposal that there should be established an "Official List" for the specific trivial names of species similar to the existing "Official List" for the names of genera. The "Pleins pouvoirs" Resolution adopted by the Congress at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913 expressly authorised the Commission to use those powers to stabilise the nomenclature of species as well as that of genera and it must, we think, have been due to an oversight that, when the Congress then established an "Official List" for generic names, they did not also establish an "Official List" for specific trivial names, for in each case the establishment of such a "List" is an essential corollary to the grant of the "pleins pouvoirs." We recommend that the selection of specific trivial names to be placed on the new "Official List" should be guided by principles similar to those adopted in the selection of generic names for addition to the existing "Official List." We accordingly propose first that every specific trivial name, the use of which is stabilised by the Commission under their "pleins pouvoirs," should be placed on this "List," second that every effort should be made to place on this "List" the trivial names of species of importance in systematic or applied zoology. We propose also that there should be placed on this "List" the trivial names of species which are the type species of genera, the names of which have been stabilised by being placed on the "Official List" for generic names, save in those cases where the name of the nominal species concerned is invalid or not the oldest name for the species concerned, in which case we should propose to place on the "List" the oldest available trivial name for the species in question. We have considered carefully the question of the title to be given to the new "Official List" and are of the opinion that the most appropriate title would be "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." We make this recommendation because we consider it important to stress the fact that the name so to be stabilised is the trivial name of the species in question and that, although it will be necessary in each case to cite the generic name in combination with which the trivial name in question was originally published, the fact that the binominal combination is specified in the entry to be made in this "Official List" is not intended to confer—and will not, in fact, confer—any status upon that binominal combination or to imply any view on the taxonomic question

of the genus to which the species in question should be referred. Where, as in certain of the cases which we have dealt with during our present Session, there is any doubt as to the identity of the species to which a given specific trivial name is applicable, it is our intention, by referring to a figure or otherwise, to indicate precisely the species to which the name in question is to be applied. Finally, we recommend that specific trivial names placed on the new " Official List " should be accorded a status similar to that which we recommend should now be accorded to the names of genera placed on the existing " Official List," that is to say that a specific trivial name stabilised in this way is not to be rejected in favour of some other name without the prior approval of the International Commission, even where it may later be shown that the trivial name in question was placed on the " Official List " in error. We attach great importance to the " Official List " now proposed to be established and we trust that the status proposed to be given to names placed on this " List " will stimulate zoologists to co-operate actively to secure the addition to this " List " of the trivial names of all the more important species in the groups with which they are concerned, thereby achieving at the species level a far-reaching degree of stability in the nomenclature of the groups in question. The Section on Nomenclature, realising the importance of the issues involved, warmly support our proposals in this matter.

48. *The " pleins pouvoirs " to suspend the " Règles " granted to the Commission by the Congress in* 1913.—We propose that the " pleins pouvoirs " Resolution of 1913 shall be amended in various respects to meet the requirements of the changes in procedure recommended in the earlier part of the present Report (paragraph 32). We propose also that words should be added to make it clear that these powers are intended for use, especially, *inter alia* (1) to preserve names of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and horticulture and in the teaching of zoology at universities and elsewhere, (2) to prevent existing nomenclatorial practice from being thrown into synonymy by the unearthing of forgotten works or of forgotten names in well-known works, and (3) to stabilise the application of well-known names where, in the absence of such intervention by the Commission, it is likely that it would always be a matter of dispute to which of two or more species a given name is properly applicable under the *Règles*. Of these proposals, the first two were suggested to us by the Section on Nomenclature, while the third which we put forward ourselves secured immediately the enthusiastic support of the Section. Finally, we recommend that this Resolution, as amended above, should now be incorporated in the *Règles*, in order to make it clear to every zoologist that the provisions embodied therein are of force and vigour equal to that of any of the provisions of the *Règles*. In this matter also we have the full-hearted support of the Section on Nomenclature.

49. *The preparation of the substantive French text of the " Règles " as now proposed to be amended.*—The task of preparing the substantive French text of the *Règles* will involve highly technical problems, the solution of which will call for the employment of experts. The Commission have accordingly proposed to the Section on Nomenclature, and the Section has agreed, on the following course of procedure. The record of the decisions of the Congress in so far as

these relate to changes in the *Règles*, together with the supporting memoranda on which these decisions were based, should be referred to jurists with instructions to prepare the draft of the new substantive French text together with a literal English translation, and that these two drafts should then be circulated by the Secretary to each member of the Commission to provide him with an opportunity for examining the texts to ensure that they faithfully embody the decisions of the Congress, and neither add anything to, nor omit anything from, these decisions. At the end of three calendar months from the date of the drafts being so circulated, any points falling within the above field which may have been elicited by the foregoing consultations should, we recommend, be referred for determination to a special Editorial Committee consisting of the following three Members and Alternate Members of the Commission who had been present throughout the Paris discussions : Mr. Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) and Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.). Immediately a decision had been reached on any such points the *Règles*, as amended by the present Congress, should be promulgated with the least possible delay.

50. The revised *Règles* should, we propose, enter into force as from the date on which they are published. We anticipate, however, that it will be possible at a considerably earlier date to publish in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* the minutes of the meetings of the Commission at its Paris Session and we propose that the Congress should recommend all zoologists thereafter to take as their guide the record of the Paris decisions as contained in these minutes during the, as we hope, short period which will elapse between the publication of the Paris minutes and the formal promulgation of the revised *Règles*.

Part 4. Conclusion.

51. The Paris meeting of the Commission marks a turning-point in the history of zoological nomenclature, for the Commission, with the active support of the Section on Nomenclature, has both carried through a complete codification of the law as it stood at the opening of the Congress and has also put forward new proposals of the greatest importance and value on questions which previously found no mention in the *Règles* or only provisions of the most inadequate character. At the same time, as part of the process of codification, nearly one-quarter of the body of *Opinions* has been deprived of all but a historical interest and this process will be virtually completed on the publication of the *Règles* as amended at the present meeting and of the volume containing the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Finally, the status of that List has been materially enhanced and with it the prospect of securing stability in generic nomenclature. As for the trivial names of species, an important advance in the direction of stabilisation has been achieved by the decision to establish for such names an *Official List* parallel to that already in existence for generic names.

52. Much remains to be done, but with the help of the revised *Règles* adopted at the present Congress zoologists will be in an incomparably better position to judge in which directions further improvements are still required than if they had still to thread their way through the maze of independent decisions by which hitherto they have had to guide themselves in their daily work. The

Commission are determined that, so far as it lies in their power to prevent it, zoologists shall never again be required to struggle with an undigested mass of decisions built up over a long period. To this end, the Commission have decided, and they now give their assurance to the Congress, that at each subsequent meeting of the Congress they will submit recommendations for the incorporation in the *Règles* of any conclusions which they may have reached since the previous meeting of the Congress, so that by thus harvesting the results of their work they may be able at every such meeting to secure that every zoologist shall be able to find within the covers of a single volume a full, detailed and authoritative record of the entire body of international law on zoological nomenclature.

53. The Paris Congress of 1948 has been a meeting of outstanding achievement in the field of zoological nomenclature and it is fitting that this achievement should have been secured in the same city as that in which almost 60 years ago the first important steps were taken to establish an international code of nomenclature for living creatures.

54. In submitting our Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, we desire to express in the warmest terms our sense of gratitude for the interest, help and support which we have throughout received at the hands both of our French hosts and of all other members of the Congress and to place on record our conviction that it is to this spirit of co-operation and the strength which it gives that must be attributed the outstanding results achieved.

55. The present Report was unanimously adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at a meeting held at the Sorbonne to-day, 26th July, 1948.

Signed on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature,

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Paris,
26*th July*, 1948.

SUBMISSION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY BY THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

At a joint meeting of the Section on Nomenclature and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature held yesterday morning (26th July, 1948), the International Commission submitted to the Section on Nomenclature the foregoing Report in which they had incorporated certain suggestions made during a joint meeting between the two bodies held earlier that morning.

2. On receiving the Report of the Commission, the Section on Nomenclature unanimously adopted a Resolution giving their specific approval to each and all of the individual recommendations submitted by the Commission and approving the Report as a whole for submission to the International Congress of Zoology at the plenary session to be held to-day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948).

3. In accordance with the request of the Section on Nomenclature, the Report unanimously adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly submitted herewith, on behalf both of the Section on Nomenclature and of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, for the approval of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology.

Signed on behalf of the Section on Nomenclature,

FRANCIS HEMMING
President of the Section.

Paris,
27th July, 1948.

REPORT ON THE USE OF THE EXPRESSION "NOMENCLATURE BINAIRE" IN THE "RÈGLES INTERNATIONALES DE LA NOMENCLATURE ZOOLOGIQUE" BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

To:—
The President of the Section
on Nomenclature,
Thirteenth International Congress
of Zoology,
Paris.

Secretariat of the Commission,
Hotel Ste. Anne,
Rue Ste. Anne,
Paris (I[e]).
22nd July, 1948.

In compliance with the request addressed to us at the close of the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at Lisbon in 1935, we, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, assembled in Paris at the meeting of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, have the honour to submit the following Report on the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique.*

I. The historical background

2. The problem involved in the discussions which have for so long centred around the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " has its roots in events which took place in the earliest days of the Linnean system of zoological nomenclature. Some understanding of the history of this problem is therefore an essential preliminary to any just appraisal of the issues involved. We consider, therefore, that it will be valuable if, before setting out the conclusions which we have reached on the questions referred to us, we summarise the sequence of events which led up to the situation which prompted your predecessor to invite us to undertake the present investigation.

3. The first point to be noted is that, prior to the publication in 1758 of the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, Linnaeus and most of his contemporaries referred to each of the species of the Animal Kingdom with which they were acquainted by a scientific designation consisting of a polyverbal phrase in the Latin tongue, which consisted (i) of a noun substantive in the nominative singular (written with a capital initial letter) and (ii) any number of descriptive words, which might be either in the nominative singular in grammatical

apposition to the first word of the complete phrase or in the genitive or dative cases and in either the singular or plural number. The first word in a scientific designation of this kind (i.e. the noun substantive in the nominative singular) was used to denote each of a number of allied species and accordingly corresponds to the generic name of modern zoological nomenclature. The words which followed the initial noun substantive served to denote the species concerned within the ambit of the genus in which it was placed, but they did so in virtue of constituting an abbreviated specific diagnosis and did not constitute a name. The only scientific designation which any species possessed at that time was the complete phrase consisting of the generic name and the abbreviated diagnosis by which it was immediately followed.

4. In the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* published in 1758 Linnaeus introduced an entirely new method for giving scientific designations to species in the Animal Kingdom. Under this system the earlier method of using an abbreviated diagnosis to indicate the species was abandoned. Henceforth every species was given a name consisting of a binominal combination of two words. Of these words, the first, as in the earlier system, consisted of a noun substantive in the nominative singular. This name denoted the genus to which the species was assigned. The second word of the binominal combination consisted either (i) of a noun in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name, (ii) of a noun in the genitive singular, or (iii) of an adjective agreeing in gender, number and case with the generic name. This second word denoted the species itself and separated it from every other species placed in the same genus. The first of these names was the " nomen genericum," the second the " nomen triviale " and the binominal combination itself the " nomen specificum."

5. The binominal system of nomenclature offered very great practical advantages over that previously in use, for under this system it was possible to refer to any species by the use of a concise phrase consisting of two words and two words only in place of the long phrases previously used to denote species, phrases which by the nature of the circumstances were much too unwieldy to be conveniently memorised. By reason both of its convenience and its elegance the new system for naming species spread very rapidly and by the end of the XVIIIth century had won universal acceptance. From that time onwards the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature became the recognised system for naming species throughout the Animal Kingdom. It was accepted as a matter of course in all the unofficial codes of nomenclature drawn up during the XIXth century and equally without question was taken as the foundation of the system of zoological nomenclature first in the *Règles* adopted by the First International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in 1889 and again in the present *Règles*, as adopted at Berlin in 1901.

6. It was only to be expected, however, that a certain number of books would be published after 1757, the authors of which continued to use the older system under which species were not given names but were referred to in phrases consisting of generic names and specific diagnoses. There was in fact a period of about 40 years subsequent to 1757 in which both the new binominal system of nomenclature introduced by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* and the older system of polyverbal scientific designations were

used side by side. During this period, however, the adherents of the new system were rapidly gaining ground, while the exponents of the older method became fewer and fewer.

7. No problem of nomenclature arises in the case of books published after 1757 in which the older system was adopted, in so far as those books were concerned only with species, for clearly authors who used polyverbal descriptive phrases to designate species did not accept, at least for species, the system of nomenclature introduced by Linnaeus in 1758. A problem did arise, however, in the case of books belonging to this class in which new generic names were proposed, for these generic names, being noun substantives in the nominative singular, were indistinguishable from generic names proposed by authors who adopted the binominal system of nomenclature. It is therefore no matter for surprise that a considerable number of generic names introduced after 1757 by non-binominal authors were nevertheless accepted by contemporary workers and came into general use. An appreciable number of such names (e.g. those proposed by Brisson for the Class Aves in his *Ornithologia* published in 1760) are commonly accepted at the present day.

8. Linnaeus himself never formulated a code of rules for zoological nomenclature, apparently considering that sufficient guidance was provided by the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* itself, when read in conjunction with the principles of scientific nomenclature which he had propounded for botany in his *Philosophia botanica* of 1751. Thus zoologists received no guidance from Linnaeus on the question whether a generic name published by a non-binominal author subsequent to the introduction of the binominal system in 1758 was or was not to be accepted as an available name.

9. It was not until the meeting of the First International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1889 that a serious effort was made to formulate an authoritative international code of zoological nomenclature. By that time the majority of zoologists had come to reject generic names published by non-binominal authors, but a considerable minority had adopted the opposite point of view. This minority was to be found among specialists in practically every group of the Animal Kingdom, while some (such as ornithologists who were faced by the special problem of the Brissonian names referred to above) were practically unanimous in their support of the claims of generic names proposed by non-binominal authors. The draftsmen of the *Règles* discussed in Paris were therefore in a serious dilemma : on the one hand everyone was agreed that the *Règles* must make it clear that the recognised system of zoological nomenclature was the binominal system introduced by Linnaeus (the only question in this regard being whether the system should rank from the appearance of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* in 1758 or whether it should date from 1767, the year in which the 12th edition was published) ; on the other hand, if the binominal aspect of the Linnaean system were to be categorically proclaimed, it would arouse the opposition of those zoologists who consistently accepted generic names proposed after 1757 by non-binominal authors. Clearly a division of opinion in the Congress on this important question might well wreck the chance of securing the acceptance of the proposed international code as a whole. Regrettably, though perhaps not unnaturally,

the draftsmen decided to circumvent this difficulty by the insertion in the draft *Règles* of phraseology of a deliberately ambiguous character which it was hoped would make it possible either to accept or to reject generic names proposed by non-binominal authors. Thus it was that the ill-starred phrase " binaire et binominale " came to be introduced as the definition of the " nomenclature adoptée pour les êtres organisés."

10. The relevant passages in the " *Règles de la Nomenclature des Êtres Organisés* " adopted by the Paris Congress in 1889 are to be found first, in Article 1, second, in proviso (*b*) to Article 44 and third, in Article 45. These provisions read as follows :—

> 1. La nomenclature adoptée pour les êtres organisés est binaire et binominale. . . .
>
> 44. Le nom attribué à chaque genre . . . ne peut être que celui sous lequel ils ont été le plus anciennement designés, à la condition.
>
> (a) . . .
>
> (b) que l'auteur ait effectivement entendu appliquer les règles de la nomenclature binaire.
>
> 45. La dixième édition du *Systema Naturae* (1758) est le point de départ de la nomenclature zoologique. L'année 1758 est donc la date à laquelle les zoologistes doivent remonter pour rechercher les noms génériques ou spécifiques les plus anciens, poorvu qu'ils soient conformes aux règles fondamentales de la nomenclature.

11. The *Règles* adopted in 1889 were of the greatest value as providing for the first time an agreed international basis for the discussion of the difficult and controversial problems involved. It was not to be expected, however, that after nearly 150 years of unfettered individualism zoologists would accept without question the first attempt to introduce the rule of law, however anxious they might be—and undoubtedly were—to put an end to the state of chaos in which they found themselves. The controversy which ensued was naturally focussed around the definition to be given to the Law of Priority, for this one provision holds the key to the whole system of nomenclature. It was inevitable therefore that the compromise involved in the adoption in Paris of the ambiguous expression " binaire et binominale " should be called in question. The controversy in regard to the *Regles* of 1889 came to a head six years later when in 1895 the Third International Congress of Zoology assembled at Leyden. A successful effort was made to avoid any acrimonious discussion on the floor of the Congress, it being agreed unanimously that a further attempt should be made to secure a generally acceptable solution of the difficulties which had arisen. It was accordingly decided to establish an International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature charged with the duty of examining all codes of nomenclature then in use (including the various unofficial codes) and, in the light of that examination, to submit recommendations to the next meeting of the Congress.

12. The International Commission held a special meeting for this purpose at Baden-Baden in the year 1898 and agreed upon a Report to be submitted to the Fourth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting to be held at Cambridge (England) in the following year. Owing to the outbreak of fresh dissension the Report prepared by the Commission was not considered by the Cambridge Congress which decided to enlarge the composition of the Commission and to instruct the reconstituted Commission to continue its studies and to report thereon to the next Congress. The Commission accordingly prepared a

further draft of the proposed *Règles* and this was considered by the Fifth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Berlin in 1901. Subject only to certain minor amendments, the draft proposed by the Commission was accepted by that Congress. The *Règles* then adopted are those in force to-day, only trifling changes (apart from the redrafting of Article 30 at Boston in 1907) having since been made in the text adopted at Berlin.

13. The subject on which we have been instructed to report is dealt with in the present *Règles* in Article 2, in proviso (*b*) to Article 25 and in Article 26. The texts of these Articles as adopted by the Berlin Congress are as follows :—

> 2. La dénomination scientifique des animaux est uninominale pour le sous genre et tous les groupes superieures ; binominale pour l'espèce ; trinominale pour la sous espèce.
>
> 25. Le nom adopté pour chaque genre et chaque espèce ne peut être que celui sous lequel ils ont été le plus anciennement designés, a la condition :
>
> (a) . . .
> (b) que l'auteur ait appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binaire.
>
> 26. La dixième édition du *Systema Naturae* de Linné (1758) est l'ouvrage qui a inauguré l'application générale de la Nomenclature binaire en zoologie. La date de 1758 est donc acceptée comme point de départ de la Nomenclature zoologique et comme entrée en vigeur de la loi de priorité.

14. When we compare the provisions adopted at Berlin (paragraph 13) with those adopted 12 years earlier in Paris (paragraph 10), we find that the discussions during that period had failed to secure agreement upon a clear-cut logical decision. The new provisions are seen to contain the same implicit contradictions as their predecessors, the only change being a shift of emphasis consequent upon changes in the phraseology employed. Those zoologists who rejected generic names prôposed by authors who did not accept the principles of binominal nomenclature scored a point by securing the deletion of the adjective " binaire " from Article 2, which replaced the former Article 1, but the value of this change was largely vitiated by the fact that in the new Article the adjective " binominale " was now made to apply to the " denomination scientique des animaux " and not, as previously, to " la nomenclature adoptée pour les êtres organisés." The proviso (*b*) to Article 44 which now became Article 25 was substantially redrafted. The new wording was such that, according to the standpoint of the reader, it could be interpreted either as supporting the strict binominal view or as upholding the contention of those who accepted as available generic names published after 1757 by non-binominal authors. Zoologists who held the first of these views could point to the fact (1) that the compromise phrase " ait effectivement entendu appliquer " had been replaced by the more definite phrase " ait appliqué " and (2) that in the later part of the same sentence the word " principes " had replaced the word " règles." On the other hand, those zoologists who took the opposite view could point to the fact that the adjective " binaire," on which they based the principal part of their case, still appeared in this proviso. When we turn to Article 26 we find that, as compared with Article 45 of the *Règles* of 1889, of which it is the counterpart, the advocates of the strictly binominal view had also made some headway, for the crucial significance of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* was considerably enhanced by the insertion of the statement that it was this work " qui a inauguré l'application générale de la Nomenclature binaire." It must be noted, however, that in this Article, as in Article 25, the

advocates of generic names published after 1757 by non-binominal authors were successful in retaining the ambiguous adjective " binaire."

15. The compromises adopted in the draft submitted to the Berlin Congress and incorporated by that body in the present *Règles* served, it may be concluded, as a valuable bridge between the strict binominalists who were implacably opposed to the wording used in the *Règles* of 1889 and those zoologists who desired to see the vindication of post-1757 generic names published by non-binominal authors, for the former had succeeded in securing a more acceptable phraseology, while the latter had been able to resist all attempts to eliminate the adjective " binaire " from the new texts. Naturally, no permanent solution could be secured by the adoption of drafting devices of this kind and it could therefore be only a matter of time before the former controversy was renewed.

16. The next occasion on which any of the foregoing Articles was considered by the International Congress of Zoology was in 1907 when the Boston Congress made a small change in Article 26 by substituting (in English) the sentence " For practical purposes the date 1st January, 1758, is accepted in these Rules . . ." for the expression (in the substantive French text) " La date de 1758 est donc acceptée . . .". This did not directly raise the issue which we are considering and accordingly did not affect the relative positions of either side in the controversy with which we are concerned.

17. Three years later (in 1910) the International Commission itself precipitated a fresh outburst of controversy by openly taking sides in this matter in an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 20, published in 1910, *Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 48-50) in which they gave their answer to a question put to them by Dr. David Starr Jordon in regard to the availability of the generic names proposed by Gronovius in the work entitled *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* published in 1763. Neither in this nor in any subsequent work did Gronovius accept the principles of binominal nomenclature. Throughout his whole working life he adopted the system of nomenclature current prior to 1758, that is to say he accepted the concept of a genus and employed a generic name in each of the scientific designations which he applied to various animals but in every case he placed after the generic name not a single word to represent the name of the species but a brief diagnosis of its distinctive characters. The case put to the Commission was thus in the nature of a test case. The answer given by the Commission was an unequivocal affirmation of the availability of the names proposed by Gronovius. A year later (1911, *Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 82–83, 87–88) this view was implicitly re-affirmed in *Opinion* 35 (" Types of genera of binary but not binominal authors ") and in *Opinion* 37 (" Shall the genera of Brisson's ' *Ornithologia,*' 1760, be accepted ? ").

18. These decisions naturally gave great satisfaction to those zoologists who desired to use generic names published after 1757 by non-binominal authors but equally naturally they gave great offence to those zoologists who adopted the strict binominalist standpoint. As was to be expected, the result was a violent renewal of the former controversy on this subject. Repeated efforts were made at successive International Congresses of Zoology to debate the validity of the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " given

by the Commission in their *Opinion* 20. The Commission at that time were resolutely opposed to any discussion of this question and for twenty years were successful in advancing procedural objections to this matter being brought before the Congress. When, however, a fresh effort was made to discuss this question at the meeting of the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology, held at Padua in 1930, the Section on Nomenclature permitted a motion on this subject to be brought forward. An acrimonious debate ensued, at the conclusion of which a vote was taken which rejected (by a majority) the view expressed by the Commission in *Opinion* 20 and categorically affirmed the strictly binominalist interpretation of Article 25. The view expressed by this vote in the Section was affirmed at the final *Concilium Plenum* of the Padua Congress (again by a majority). At that meeting, however, the whole of the Resolutions adopted by the Section were voted upon *en bloc* and no discussion of individual items was practicable or permitted.

19. The proceedings at Padua in this matter gave rise to a bitter controversy which did considerable harm to the rule of international law in matters of zoological nomenclature. Clearly some special effort was required to re-establish harmony and to provide an atmosphere in which it would be possible to find a solution which would be generally acceptable. It was with this object in view that at Lisbon in 1935 the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie* invited your predecessor as President of the Section of Nomenclature at the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology to give further consideration to this matter. Your predecessor therefore invited us, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to re-examine the question of the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles* and to submit a Report to you, Sir, as his successor, at the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology. This invitation was accepted by us on the understanding that we should be free to traverse the whole field and to submit not only our conclusions on the particular question of interpretation involved but also to put forward any recommendations for action which our investigations might prompt us to offer. Our acceptance of your predecessor's invitation was recorded by us in the Report which we submitted to the Lisbon Congress and the method of procedure so agreed upon was unanimously approved at the final *Concilium Plenum* of that Congress.

II. The meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the existing provisions of the " Règles "

20. *The nature of the problem:* The historical sketch given in the preceding section shows very clearly that the problem presented by the use of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles* is due to no accident of drafting but has its origin in a desire on the part of the draftsmen of the *Règles* to find a form of words which, by reason of its apparent ambiguity, would be acceptable both to those zoologists who accepted only those generic names published after 1757, the authors of which adopted the system of binominal nomenclature and also to those zoologists who, though themselves binominalists in their own work, nevertheless attached importance to the maintenance of certain generic names published after 1757 by authors

who accepted the principle that for taxonomic purposes allied species should be united in a single genus and that the scientific designation of a species should start with a generic name but who did not adopt the binominal system of nomenclature for species and therefore continued to use the older system of nomenclature under which within a given genus a species was designated not by a name consisting of a single word but by descriptive epithets constituting a brief specific diagnosis.

21. The problem with which we are concerned is however not what was the intention of the draftsmen of the *Règles* when they inserted the expression " nomenclature binaire " in proviso (*b*) to Article 25. Our task is entirely different, being to determine what, on a due and proper construction of the words used in the *Règles*, is the meaning which does in fact adhere to the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in that document. We have therefore to determine (1) whether the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 is identical in meaning with the expression " nomenclature binominale," or (2) whether, as there used, this expression has a wider meaning and denotes a system of nomenclature which may or may not be binominal for species but which is distinguished from every other system of nomenclature of species by the acceptance of the proposition that the scientific designation (i.e. the " dénomination scientifique " specified in Article 2 of the *Règles*) of a species embraces two concepts, the first that of the genus, the second that of the species.

22. *The meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the "Règles":* In view of the conditions under which the present task was entrusted to us and on which it was accepted by us, we regard it as our duty to approach *de novo* the question of the interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles*. In discharging the duty entrusted to us, we have therefore considered this question solely from the juridical standpoint and have set aside as irrelevant all the arguments previously advanced in this matter either by our predecessors in the Commission or by individual zoologists, except in so far as those arguments were directed to this particular aspect of the problem.

23. The whole controversy in regard to the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " has centred around the use of that expression in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25, for it is that Article which determines whether a given generic name is possessed of rights under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was first published (i.e. as from which, in the words of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25, it was first " divulgué dans une publication "). As used in Article 25 the expression " nomenclature binaire " is a term of art, for the meaning of which no clue is given in that Article. Accordingly, if this was the sole place in the *Règles* in which this expression occurred, it would be necessary for us first to examine the leading dictionaries in the French language and other authoritative sources bearing on that language for the purpose of determining the meaning or meanings which properly attach in that language to the adjective " binaire." Having reached a conclusion on this subject we should have next to consider what meaning properly attaches to the expression " nomenclature binaire " as applied to the system of nomenclature embodied in the *Règles*. In this second part of our inquiry it would be our duty to take

note of the fact that Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 is concerned with the status of names proposed by authors, who had applied the principles of binary nomenclature (" ait appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binaire ") and not merely with the status of names proposed by authors who had applied binary nomenclature. It would be necessary for us in these circumstances to consider whether the insertion of the words " les principes de " before the words " nomenclature binaire " qualified the meaning which in this context should be applied to the latter expression.

24. It is a well-recognised principle of interpretation that the same meaning is to be attached throughout any given document to every expression used therein, except in so far as the document expressly provides that a given expression as used in one part is to be interpreted in a sense different from that attaching to that expression as used in other parts of the document. Our first task was therefore to ascertain whether, and if so, where, the expression " nomenclature binaire " is used in the *Règles* in addition to its use in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25. On this question we found that the expression " nomenclature binaire " is used on two occasions in the *Règles*, the first being in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25, the second being in Article 26. As already explained (paragraph 23), the first of these Articles, when referring to " nomenclature binaire," throws no light on the meaning to be attached to that expression. We accordingly next turned our attention to Article 26.

25. The reference to " nomenclature binaire " in Article 26 is to be found in the first sentence, which reads as follows :—" La dixième édition du *Systema Naturae* de Linné (1758) est l'ouvrage qui a inauguré l'application générale de la nomenclature binaire en zoologie." This passage is highly significant, for it lays down the proposition that in no book published prior to the appearance in 1758 of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus had " nomenclature binaire " been generally applied and that in the above work Linnaeus had introduced some novel feature of nomenclature which distinguished it from all previously published works and thus made the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* the work which inaugurated the general application of binary nomenclature in zoology (" qui a inauguré l'application générale de la nomenclature binaire en zoologie "). The second sentence of Article 26 emphasises and reinforces the significance attached to the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* by the first sentence. The opening words of the second sentence of Article 26 were amended in English at the Seventh International Congress of Zoology held at Boston in 1907, but unfortunately through some unaccountable oversight no text in the French language was approved for incorporation in the substantive French text of the *Règles*. For the moment, therefore, the position is that, pending the removal of this anomaly (on which a separate recommendation is being submitted to the Paris Congress), the first part of the authoritative text of this sentence is in the English language and the second part in the French language. The text of this sentence accordingly reads as follows :—" For practical purposes the date 1st January, 1758, is accepted in these Rules comme point de départ de la Nomenclature zoologique et comme entrée en vigeur de la loi de priorité." When we read these two sentences together, we see that the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of

Linnaeus not only inaugurated the general application of binary nomenclature in zoology but is also to be taken as the starting point of zoological nomenclature and the work as from which the Law of Priority enters into force.

26. Thus Article 26 establishes the proposition that the feature which distinguishes " nomenclature binaire " from all other types of nomenclature in zoology is a feature which first appeared in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus. This is a proposition of cardinal importance, for clearly, if we can detect the feature in the nomenclature used by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* which distinguished the nomenclature so used from any system of nomenclature previously used in zoology, we shall thereby have detected the feature which distinguishes " nomenclature binaire " from all other types of zoological nomenclature.

27. The task so set is extremely simple, for the nomenclature used by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* follows that previously used by Linnaeus and other zoologists in every respect except one. The one feature of the nomenclature used by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* which was absolutely novel was the consistent application of a binominal system of nomenclature for species. Under this system each species was given a specific name (*nomen specificum*) consisting of two words, of which the first was the generic name (*nomen genericum*), the second the trivial name of the species itself (*nomen triviale*). For many years Linnaeus and other authors had applied a generic name to each species, but the substitution of a specific trivial name consisting of a single word for the polyverbal diagnostic phrases formerly used to indicate the species concerned was a complete innovation. It was this innovation which both attracted immediate attention and secured general approval from contemporary zoologists who recognised that in making this change Linnaeus had introduced a new and most valuable feature into zoological nomenclature.

28. Now that we have established that it was the binominal character of the system of nomenclature in zoology introduced by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of his *Systema Naturae* which distinguished—and which alone distinguished—the system of nomenclature there employed from that employed in all previous works on zoology, we see at once that this must be the feature of the nomenclature used in that book which leads Article 26 to lay down the proposition that this was the book which inaugurated the general application of binary nomenclature (" l'ouvrage qui a inauguré l'application générale de la Nomenclature binaire "). Thus we see that in Article 26 the expression " nomenclature binaire " is completely synonymous with the expression " nomenclature binominale."

29. Now that we know beyond possibility of doubt what is the meaning which is properly attributable to the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in Article 26, we know also the meaning similarly attributable to that expression as used in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25, for (as explained in paragraph 24 above) the meaning attached to this expression in one part of the *Règles* must be the same as that attached to it in every other part, having regard to the fact that the *Règles* do not contain any express (or even implied) provision requiring a different interpretation to be adopted in one part from that adopted in another. We thus reach the conclusion that the meaning of the expression

" nomenclature binaire " as used in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 is identical with the meaning which attaches to the expression " nomenclature binominale " and that the meaning of the Proviso as a whole would remain absolutely unchanged if the adjective " binominale " were substituted for the adjective " binaire."

III. Conclusions and recommendations

30. In the preceding Section we have established (1) that the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles* as they exist today is completely synonymous with the expression " nomenclature binominale " and consequently (2) that under the *Règles* no generic name has availability under the Law of Priority (Article 25), unless, *inter alia*, the author by whom it was published was an author who in the book concerned applied the principles of binominal nomenclature.

31. We turn now to consider whether the foregoing meaning of Article 25 is the meaning which it is desirable that that Article should have, for clearly, if it is not, it would be our duty to recommend the directions in which it is desirable that that Article should be amended. At the same time we consider what amendments of drafting character are required in Article 25 in order to eliminate all possibilities of doubt in the future as to the meaning intended.

32. Article 26 clearly lays down the proposition that the feature in the nomenclature used by Linnaeus in 1758 in the 10th edition of his *Systema Naturae* which makes that book the starting point of zoological nomenclature and the book as from the appearance of which the Law of Priority begins to operate, is the binominal character of the nomenclature used for species. This being so, it is logical and proper that Article 25, as the Article which prescribes the conditions in which the Law of Priority is to apply, should expressly refer to the chief characteristic of the Linnean system of nomenclature and should require its acceptance by any author to be a condition precedent to the recognition of the availability of any generic names which he may propose. We agree therefore that the object underlying the insertion of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 is sound and should be preserved. In reaching this conclusion we do not prejudge the question whether there should be inserted in this Article provisions which would in certain circumstances secure availability for generic names published after 1757 by non-binominal authors. This latter subject raises issues of an entirely different kind which we discuss in paragraphs 34–36 below.

33. On the question of drafting, we are unhesitatingly of the opinion that the misleading and ambiguous expression " nomenclature binaire," which (as we have seen) has been the cause of so much controversy, should be deleted both from Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 and from Article 26 and that in each case the expression " nomenclature binominale " should be inserted in its place.

34. We have now to consider whether special provisions should be inserted in Article 25 to secure that in certain circumstances generic names published after 1757 should be available under the Law of Priority in those cases where the authors by whom the names were published did not accept the principles of binominal nomenclature. We are definitely of the opinion that it is desirable

that such provision should be made, if not in this Article, at least in some part of the *Règles*. We hold this view because it was the existence of generic names which were important (in the sense that they were commonly applied to well-known genera), and would be rendered invalid if the strict binominalist view were to be enforced, which led to the arid controversy regarding the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire " which has been in progress intermittently for the last 50 years or more. It would, in our view, be most unreasonable to take action which would invalidate these names at the very moment when, as we hope, we are on the point of reaching a permanent settlement of the present problem. We have in mind particularly the case of the generic names in the Class Aves proposed by Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologia*, for in that case it was the erroneous interpretation of Article 25 given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in *Opinion* 20, supplemented by the express but incorrect statement in *Opinion* 37, which has misled the ornithologists into believing that they were acting in accordance with the *Règles* in accepting the generic names proposed by Brisson in 1760. To reverse the decision in regard to Brisson's generic names would clearly inflict great hardship and would certainly give rise to greater confusion than uniformity. Some action should, we consider, be taken as part of the proposed general settlement to prevent such a state of affairs from arising. We have referred especially to the problem presented by Brisson's generic names but we do not doubt that there are names now commonly in use for other important genera elsewhere in the Animal Kingdom, which are invalid because they were originally proposed by authors who did not accept the principles of binominal nomenclature but which are regarded as available by the zoologists by whom they are being used, those zoologists basing their opinion on the interpretation, now seen to be erroneous, given by the International Commission in 1910 in their *Opinion* 20.

35. We have considered carefully the question of the machinery required to ensure that in cases such as those discussed above the clarification of Article 25 which we recommend should not have the effect of rendering invalid names now commonly in use for important genera, in those cases where the original authors of those names did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature in the books in which they first published those names. If no powers existed for the suspension of the *Règles* in those cases where the strict application of the *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, we should certainly have recommended the addition to Article 25 of provisions designed to secure this end in the case of well-known generic names originally proposed by non-binominal authors. But ever since 1913 there has existed a method prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology for meeting cases of this kind, for in that year the Monaco meeting of the Congress conferred plenary powers upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suspend the *Règles* in any case where the Commission was satisfied that the strict application of the *Règles* would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. There is therefore no need to devise new powers for the purpose which we have in view. There is however a need for the incorporation in the *Regles* of an Article formally recording the decision in this matter taken by the Monaco Congress. It is our intention to recommend the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology during its present meeting to approve the insertion of

such a provision in the *Règles*. It is further our intention to recommend that the Congress approve the addition to the *Règles* of a Schedule (to be known as the "First Schedule") in which will be recorded every decision taken by the International Commission, when acting under their plenary powers on behalf of the Congress, the present *Appendice* being known in future as the "Second Schedule" (to the *Règles*). In these circumstances we consider that there is no need to insert any special provision in Article 25 for the purpose of dealing with the particular case of generic names which it may be desired to preserve notwithstanding the fact that they were proposed by authors who did not on the occasion in question apply the principles of binominal nomenclature.

36. Our conclusion on this aspect of our problem is that, when (as we propose) the Plenary Powers Resolution of March 1913 is formally incorporated into the *Règles*, everything necessary will have been provided if in addition the two following proposals are also adopted :—

(1) In view of the fact that the generic names proposed by non-binominal authors now in common use in certain groups are in such use by reason of the acceptance by the specialists concerned of the interpretation of Article 25 given by the International Commission in *Opinion* 20, which is now seen to have been erroneous, we are of the opinion that all practicable speed should be shown in securing availability under Article 25 for such names. We accordingly recommend that, in the Article proposed to be added to the *Règles* embodying the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution, there should be inserted a provision exempting applications in cases of the type here under consideration from the requirement that a period of at least one year shall elapse between the date on which the application is despatched for advertisement and the date on which the Commission may take a final decision thereon.

(2) Having regard to the fact that as far back as 1911 the Commission rendered an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 37) in which (although erroneously, as we now see) they stated that the generic names proposed by Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologia* complied with the requirements of the *Règles* we recommend that the present Congress should direct that the entry "Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologia sive Synopsis methodica sistens Avium divisionem in Ordines*" be added forthwith to the proposed First Schedule as the title of a work, generic names in which are to be accepted as having availability under Article 25, notwithstanding the fact that they were published by an author who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature.

37. The clarification of Article 25 which we recommend will render obsolete or otherwise incorrect the whole or part of four of the *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The following is the action which we recommend should be taken in regard to each of these *Opinions* :—

(1) *Opinions* 20 and 37. To be cancelled.

(2) *Opinion* 24. In the first sentence of the "Summary" the words "who

used a non-binominal nomenclature " to be substituted for the words " who used a binary (Art. 25) (though not binominal) nomenclature."

(3) *Opinion* 35. The title " On the species eligible for selecting as the type of a genus, where some or all of the originally included species were not cited by binominal names " to be substituted for the title " Types of genera of binary but not binominal authors."

38. The drafting amendments to Articles 25 and 26 and the incorporation in the *Règles* of an Article embodying the Resolution by which at Monaco in 1913 the Ninth International Congress of Zoology conferred on the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain cases, which we recommend, together with (*a*) the slight modification of the existing procedure when generic names proposed after 1757 by non-binominal authors are under consideration by the Commission and (*b*) the proposed immediate addition of " Brisson, 1760, Ornithologia " to the suggested First Schedule as a book, the generic names in which are to be accepted as having availability under Article 25, notwithstanding the fact that they were published by an author who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, constitute integral parts of a single recommendation and we ask that they may be treated in this light. The adoption of a solution in the foregoing terms will, we are confident, provide an equitable and logical settlement of a long standing difficulty. We therefore earnestly commend this proposal for your favourable consideration and it is our sincere hope that under your guidance these proposals may secure the approval of the Section on Nomenclature and, on its advice, the approval of the Congress in *Concilium Plenum.*

IV. Summary of principal conclusions and recommendations

39. We summarise our principal conclusions and recommendations as follows :—

(1) We are of the opinion that under a due and proper interpretation of the wording used in the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used therein is identical in meaning with the expression " nomenclature binominale."

(2) We recommend that, in order to eliminate all possibility of doubt in the future regarding the meaning of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25, the expression " nomenclature binominale " be substituted therein for the expression " nomenclature binaire."

(3) We recommend that the same change of wording be made in the first sentence of Article 26.

(4) It is desirable that the *Règles Internationales* should contain express provision to secure that, where the name commonly in use for a well-known genus is a name which was originally published after 1757 by an author who in the book concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, that name may nevertheless be made available under Article 25, when the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are satisfied that the strict application of the *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity.

(5) If no power had existed to render available generic names falling in the class specified in (4) above, we should certainly have thought it necessary to recommend that provisions to that end should be inserted in Article 25, but in view of the fact that plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in such cases have already been conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Congress of Zoology, there is no need for additional powers to be granted for the present purpose. It is, however, essential, in our view, that the existing powers should now be formally embodied in an Article of the *Règles*. We consider this essential as part of our general plans for introducing order into the present *Règles*, but, quite apart from this consideration, we are of the opinion that the formal recognition in the text of the *Règles* of the principle that in appropriate circumstances the provisions of the *Règles* can be suspended forms an indispensable part of any settlement of the problem raised by the use hitherto in the *Règles* of the expression "nomenclature binaire," for it is only by this recognition that those zoologists who attach importance to the maintenance of certain generic names published after 1757 by authors who did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature can be assured that adequate means exist in the *Règles* themselves for the consideration of those cases to which they attach great importance. We accordingly recommend that, as part of the general settlement proposed, an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* formally embodying the Resolution adopted by the International Congress of Zoology at Monaco, by which they conferred plenary powers upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suspend the *Règles* in certain cases. We further recommend that there should be added to the *Règles* a Schedule (to be known as the "First Schedule," in contrast to the present *Appendice* to be known in future as the "Second Schedule") in which are to be recorded all decisions taken by the International Commission under its plenary powers.

(6) In view of the fact that it was largely due to the failure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature earlier to detect the erroneous nature of the interpretation of Article 25 given by them in *Opinion* 20, we consider that, now that their error has been detected, the machinery to be used for dealing exceptionally with cases of the class concerned which call for the suspension of the *Règles* should be such as to permit the most expeditious action. We accordingly recommend that, in the Article embodying the plenary powers resolution which we recommend should now be added to the *Règles*, there should be inserted a provision exempting applications relating to the status of generic names published after 1757 by authors who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature from the requirement that a period of at least one year shall elapse between the date on which the application is despatched for advertisement and the date on which the Commission may take a final decision thereon.

(7) Having regard to the fact that by the incorrect statement embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 37, ornithologists have been misled ever since 1911 into believing that the generic names proposed by Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologia* complied with the provision of the *Règles*, the entry " Brisson (M.J.) 1760, *Ornithologia sive Synopsis methodica sistens Avium divisionem in Ordines* " be added forthwith to the proposed First Schedule to the *Règles* as the title of a book, generic names in which are to be accepted as having availability under Article 25, notwithstanding the fact that they were published by an author who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature.

(8) Four *Opinions* previously rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are now seen to be incorrect in whole or in part. As regards these, we recommend :—

(*a*) that *Opinions* 20 and 37 be cancelled ;

(*b*) that the words " who used a non-binominal nomenclature " be substituted for the words " who used a binary (though non-binominal) nomenclature " in the first sentence of the " Summary " to *Opinion* 24 ;

(*c*) that the words " On the species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus, where some or all of the originally included species were not cited by binominal names " be substituted for the words " Types of genera of binary but not binominal authors " as the title of *Opinion* 35.

40. The present Report was unanimously adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at a meeting held at the Sorbonne to-day, 22nd July, 1948.

Signed on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature,

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission.

Paris,
22*nd July*, 1948.

SUBMISSION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY BY THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE REPORT BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON THE USE OF THE EXPRESSION "NOMENCLATURE BINAIRE" IN THE "RÈGLES INTERNATIONALES DE LA NOMENCLATURE ZOOLOGIQUE."

At a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held at the Sorbonne this morning (Friday, 23rd July, 1948) the foregoing Report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the use of the expression " nomenclature binaire " in the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* was unanimously approved and adopted.

2. At the unanimous request both of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and of the Section on Nomenclature, this Report is now submitted to the International Congress of Zoology for approval at their final plenary session to be held on Tuesday next, 27th July, 1948.

3. The Report now submitted was prepared in compliance with an arrangement approved by the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its final plenary session held at Lisbon in September, 1935, under which, on receiving a request from the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie* that further consideration should be given by the Section on Nomenclature to the question of the use in the *Règles Internationales* of the expression " nomenclature binaire " which had been the subject of debate by the Section on Nomenclature of the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Padua in 1930, the President had referred the matter back to the International Commission for further examination and report. In submitting the present Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature have discharged the duty severally laid upon them by the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology.

Signed on behalf of the Section on Nomenclature,

FRANCIS HEMMING,
President of the Section.

Paris,
23*rd July*, 1948.

PURCHASED
14 JUL 1950

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Parts 1–21 have already been published and the remaining Parts, containing the subject index, are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume has been devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature. Parts 1–6 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD., Westminster, London

VOLUME 5. Part 7
pp. 169–194, T.P.—(IV)

9th June 1959

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

PURCHASED
21 [illegible] 1959

CONTENTS :

Concluding Matter and Title Page

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

1959

Price Five Shillings

(All rights reserved)

As a result of a trade dispute in the British Printing Industry, publication of Part 7 of Volume 5 of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature could not be completed on the scheduled date, 9th June, 1959.

The effective publication date was 17th August, 1959, and the date as printed should be amended accordingly.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 5, Part 7 pp. 169–194, T.P.–(IV) 17th August ~~6th June~~, 1959

WORK OF THE SECRETARIAT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE DURING THE PERIOD 1936–1948

Report by the Secretary prepared for consideration at the meeting held in Paris in July 1948

PURCHASED
21 AUG 1959

(ABSTRACT)

The Report covers the period of about twelve years from the election in October 1936 of Mr. Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission up to the preparation in the spring and summer of this year (1948) of documentation for consideration by the Commission at its Session to be held in July.

2. Transitional arrangements made by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 in respect of the period following the resignation by Dr. C. W. Stiles of the Secretaryship and the election of his successor : The problems relating to the organisation of the Office of the Commission discussed in the present Report took their origin from the decision by Dr. C. W. Stiles to resign the Secretaryship after a total term of thirty-nine years' service announced at the meeting of the Commission held at Lisbon in September 1935 (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 45–46). In order to facilitate the process of the transfer of functions Dr. Stiles consented to officiate as Acting Secretary pending the election of his successor. That election took place on 6th October 1936 when Mr. Francis Hemming, one of the United Kingdom Members of the Commission, was unanimously elected to be Secretary on a spare-time honorary basis. At the time of the announcement at Lisbon of Dr. Stiles's resignation the Commission adopted a resolution delegating to the President and the new Secretary when elected plenary powers for organising the office of the Commission at its new headquarters when established and for taking such action as might be necessary " to obtain the finance required for the due functioning of the Commission, and generally to secure the effective continuance of the work of the Commission " (1943, *loc. cit.* **1** : 48).

3. Establishment of the Secretariat in London : Upon being notified (by President Jordan) of his election as Secretary, Mr. Hemming set up the Secretariat of the Commission in his private residence where it was given accommodation rent-free. As and when the records of the Commission gradually reached London, they were sorted by subjects and given Registered Numbers in a Series (Z.N.(S.)) then established. The Commission possessed no funds or assets of any kind at the time of transfer and one of the first tasks undertaken was to raise at least enough money to enable a modest start to be made with the work of the Commission. The efforts then made raised a sum of about

£300 (1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : xxvii). Another question of great importance which presented considerable difficulty was the question of the arrangements to be made for the publication of the Commission's *Opinions*, for the continuance of the previous arrangement under which these documents were published by the Smithsonian Institution in its *Miscellaneous Collections* was no longer practical even if it had been appropriate. It was finally decided that in future *Opinions* should be published by the Commission itself, the proceeds so obtained being applied towards meeting expenditure on printing. The first three *Opinions* (*Opinions* 134–136) published under the foregoing arrangement were issued in August 1939. The decisions on these and other matters taken under the procedure laid down at Lisbon (paragraph 2 above) at a Plenary Conference held in London in June 1939 between the President and the Secretary (1943, *loc. cit.* **1** : 70–86) are set out in detail later in the present Report.[1]

4. Difficulties created by the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939 and the temporary closing of the Secretariat : The arrangements described above had hardly been brought into effect before the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939 gave rise to fresh problems of a most serious kind. These were : first, the steps to be taken to protect the scientific and other records of the Commission against the risk of destruction by air attack ; second, the measures to be adopted to prevent the disruption of international postal communications from endangering the existence of the Commission as a body. The first of these risks was met by the evacuation of the documents of the Commission from London to the country and the temporary closure of the Secretariat. The second risk was countered by the adoption of extraordinary powers by President Karl Jordan who for this purpose executed an instrument styled the " Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 ", under which he was empowered to issue from time to time " Directions " on matters as regards which action was necessary in order to maintain the existence of the Commission and which by reason of the state of war could not otherwise be authorised. The principal purposes for the attainment of which " Directions " were issued by President Jordan are referred to briefly in paragraph 8 below. The " Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 " and the " Directions " issued by President Jordan are reproduced in full in Appendix 1 of the present Report.[2]

5. Reopening of the Secretariat of the Commission in 1942 and formulation of a revised programme of work : By the summer of 1942 it appeared unlikely that London would be subject to severe air attack and it was accordingly decided to reopen the Secretariat of the Commission in the free accommodation (at 87, Fellows Road, London, N.W.3) then offered by the Secretary. At the same time a revised programme of work was drawn up which included such matters as the reform of the Commission's procedure, the advancement of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and its publication in book-form

[1] The passages here referred have been omitted from the present Abstract of Mr. Hemming's Report.

[2] The Appendix here referred to has been omitted from the present Abstract.

and the drawing-up of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* in directions where experience had shown this to be desirable (1943, *loc. cit.* **1** : xxi–xxvi).

6. Establishment in 1943 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " : The one major problem not settled by the Plenary Conference in 1939 (paragraph 2 above) was the method to be adopted for bringing applications on questions of nomenclature submitted for decision (i) before the members of the Commission for decision and (ii) before zoologists generally for individual comment. A solution of this difficulty was found by the decision in 1942 to establish a serial publication styled the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ", in which would be published applications on individual cases submitted by specialists, comments furnished by specialists on applications so published and other matters of general interest in the field of zoological nomenclature. The first Part of Volume 1 was published on 21st May 1943. Altogether eleven Parts (pp. 328) have been published in the period covered by the Report.

7. Publication of " Opinions " and " Declarations " during the period under review : During the period from August 1939 to the eve of the Paris Congress 90 Parts of the " Opinions and Declarations " Series were published. These comprised 61 *Opinions* and 12 *Declarations*, 16 *Opinions* re-issued with annotations, and one Index Part (pp. 1166). Particulars are given in Appendix 2 where the titles of each unit published are set out in full.[3]

8. Personnel Problems : The Report describes the action taken between 1936 and 1948 to maintain the personnel of the Commission at its full level. This action was of two kinds. First, it was necessary to maintain in existence each of the six-members Classes into which the Membership of the Commission is divided by renewing those Classes as and when their nine-year term of service expired. In so far as Classes expired during the war, the required new Classes were set up by the issue by the President of " Directions " under the Emergency Powers procedure (paragraph 4 above) ; at the same time the retiring Members of the outgoing Classes were reappointed to the Commission as Members of the new Classes then established. By similar " Directions " the Officers of the Commission were confirmed in their posts when the Classes of which they were members became time-expired. The second way in which action was taken to maintain the membership of the Commission took the form of filling vacancies as and when these occurred or became known. Five vacancies (including two known at the close of the Lisbon Congress) were filled in the period up to September 1939, at which date the membership was once more at its full level of eighteen. Seven further vacancies occurred during, and since the close of, the war. In each case elections have since been held, and in consequence the Commission will be at full strength when its forthcoming Meeting opens in Paris. Full particulars are given in the Report both of the losses sustained and of the elections made to fill the vacancies so caused.

[3] The Appendix here referred to has been omitted from the present Abstract.

Where vacancies have been caused by death, the Commission will deplore the loss so sustained. In particular, long and valuable associations were broken by the death in 1942 of Dr. C. W. Stiles who had been a member of the Commission for forty-seven years, for thirty-nine of which he held the post of Secretary and by the death in 1943 of Dr. Leonhard Stejneger who had been a member of the Commission for forty-five years, having been one of the ten zoologists elected to the Commission when in 1898 its membership was increased by the Cambridge Congress from five to fifteen.

9. Creation of Additional Offices : Two further Offices were created in 1939, namely those of Vice-President and Assistant Secretary respectively. The first to be elected to the Vice-Presidency so created was Dr. Stiles, this post being offered to him as a compliment in view of the outstanding services rendered by him to the Commission during his term of Office as Secretary. Full particulars are given in the Report of the subsequent elections to these Offices as and when they became vacant.

10. Income and Expenditure during the Period under Review : As has already been explained, the Commission possessed no income or funds of any kind at the time of the transfer of the Secretariat from Washington to London, the work in London being started with the help of grants then obtained from a small number of learned societies. The first Accounts to be prepared ran from 6th October 1936 (the date of the election of Mr. Hemming as Secretary) to 31st December 1942. Messrs. W. B. Keen & Co., Chartered Accountants (then of 224, Regent Street, London, W.1) were appointed as Auditors. As will be seen from the accounts for the above period, activity was at a low level owing mainly to the difficulties created by the war (1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : xxvii–xxxiii). In June 1943 an Appeal for a Fund of £1,800 was issued for the purpose of enabling the work of the Commission to be brought up to date (1943, *ibid.* **1** : xxxiv–xl). In 1944, the first year following the issue of this Appeal brought in gifts amounting to a total of £774. In spite of wartime difficulties (paper rationing, shortage of labour at the printing works) 1943 was a year of considerable activity, twelve *Opinions* being published and in addition a large number of others prepared. There was also in that year a considerable increase in income from sales of publications. The Accounts and accompanying Reports were published in 1944 (*ibid.* **1** : xli–lviii). In 1946 the Office of the Commission was notified by the firm of printers which it had hitherto employed that it had decided to give up printing material for scientific societies and similar bodies after work currently in hand had been completed. This was a severe setback for the Commission, it not having been possible as yet to find another printer free to undertake the specialised work required to meet the needs of the Commission. One of the consequences has been that it has not been possible so far to publish the Accounts for the year 1945 and subsequent years. Those Accounts are, however, annexed to the present Report. There is, it will be noted, a difference in form between the Accounts for the Years 1945 and 1946 and those for the Year 1947. This is because the Accounts for the first two of these years were prepared in the

simple form suitable for an unincorporated body such as the Commission, while those for the Year 1947 have been prepared in the slightly more complex form required by the provisions of the Companies Acts, this change being necessary because it was in that year that responsibility for the conduct of financial affairs passed from the unincorporated Commission to the then-newly-incorporated Trust. The Accounts for the Commission for the years 1945 and 1946 are given in Appendix 3, while those for the Trust for the Year 1947 are given in Appendix 4. The Accounts for the first two of the years involved resemble substantially those for previous years. The Accounts for 1947 are, however, noteworthy for the munificent scale on which assistance has been forthcoming from U.N.E.S.C.O. The grant so allotted covers the two-year period 1947–1948 as a whole, and it has not proved possible to determine with U.N.E.S.C.O. the exact amount of that body's grant attributable to the Year 1947. As shown in the Accounts, the amount of grant expected to become finally chargeable in respect of that year is £1,020[4]. In view of the exceptionally close connection between the Financial Years 1947 and 1948, it is considered that it would be helpful if the Accounts for those years were to be published simultaneously. It is proposed therefore to insert in Appendix 4 the Accounts for the Year 1948 before the present Report is published[5].

11. Incorporation in 1947 of the "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature" : By the year 1946 the unincorporated Commission was in possession of funds of an appreciable amount—its net assets at the beginning of that year amounting to about £2,000—together with considerable stocks of publications not specifically valued. The Secretary then took the view that this situation was anomalous and should be brought to an end as soon as possible. Accordingly it was then agreed that there should be set up in the United Kingdom an incorporated body which would undertake responsibility for the conduct of the business affairs of the Commission ; as from the date of the establishment of this body the Commission would transfer to the new body such assets as it might then possess, while the new body would assume responsibility for all liabilities previously incurred on behalf of the Commission, but not at that time discharged. Expert legal advice was taken as to the form

---

[4] The sum of £1,020 provisionally inserted in the Accounts for 1947 was later approved by U.N.E.S.C.O. as a final charge against its grant for that year. The sum similarly accepted for grant in the 1948 Accounts was £1,496. In addition there was so accepted in the 1949 Accounts a final sum of £2,673. The total amount ultimately received in respect of the grant provisionally notified by U.N.E.S.C.O. in 1947 was therefore £5,189.

[5] The publication of the Accounts for the period 1945–1948 fills the gap which has hitherto existed between the published Accounts for the period up to the end of 1944 and those for the period beginning with the calendar year 1949. References to the places where the Accounts for the first of the above periods have been published have been given in the present Report. Those for the years 1949 onwards are as follows :—Year 1949, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 353–361 ; Year 1950, *ibid.* **2** : 362–371 ; Year 1951, *ibid.* **6** : 373–381 ; Year 1952, *ibid.* **9** : iii–xiii ; Year 1953, *ibid.* **9** : xv–xxix ; Year 1954, *ibid.* **11** : iii–xvii ; Year 1955, *ibid.* **12** : iii–xxv ; Year 1956, *ibid.* **13** : iii–xxvii. The Accounts for the Year 1957 have not yet been published but particulars of the salient features of those Accounts were included in a general Report on the work carried out in the five-year period 1953–1957 prepared for submission to the International Union for Biological Sciences at its General Assembly held in London in July 1958 (1958, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **15**(39) : i–viii).

of body to be established and as to the terms of the document under which it was to be incorporated. This was a matter which would become of great practical importance to the Commission as soon as it began to make a net profit on its sales, for under United Kingdom law bodies engaged in strictly scientific activities are eligible as charities for exemption from taxation, provided that they satisfy certain specified requirements. The advice received in the present case was that the best course would be to form under the United Kingdom Companies Acts what is known as a non-profit-making company having no share capital and being limited by guarantee. The title selected for this body was the " International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature ". One of the essential features of the constitution of a body seeking to establish exemption from taxation on the grounds described above is that its constitution should be such as to make it impossible for it to make any payment by way of dividend, bonus or the like to any of its members. A second essential provision is that, if the body were to be wound-up or dissolved, the net assets remaining after all debts had been discharged shall not be given to, or distributed among, the members but shall be given or transferred to some other Institution or Institutions, provided, *inter alia*, that the Regulations of the Institution or Institutions concerned prohibit the distribution of its or their income or property amongst its or their Members to an extent at least as great as is imposed by the Regulations governing the United Kingdom company concerned. These and other necessary provisions having a like object were inserted in the draft of Memorandum and Articles of Association of the company. These documents, before being approved and signed, were submitted to the United Kingdom Revenue Authorities in case there were any observations which those bodies wished to make. Those Authorities replied that, if a company were to be incorporated with the Memorandum and Articles of Association submitted, they would be disposed to regard it for taxation purposes as a body established for charitable ends. The company was thereupon incorporated under the Companies Acts (as No. 429091) on 5th February 1947.

12. Mr. Hemming's visit to the United States and Canada in the period December 1947 to January 1948 : Towards the close of 1947 a communication was received by Mr. Hemming as Secretary to the Commission from Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Secretary to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., inviting him to visit Washington and other centres in North America for the purpose of holding discussions on zoological nomenclature. This invitation was warmly welcomed by Mr. Hemming, who accordingly paid a brief but crowded visit to America in the period December 1947 to January 1948. In addition to the discussions at Washington, Mr. Hemming visited also New York where meetings were held at the American Museum of Natural History; Chicago, where the American Association for the Advancement of Science was holding its annual meeting and where numerous specialist societies were also meeting; Ottawa where the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America was being held. Further, the opportunity provided by Mr. Hemming's visit to the United States was taken to secure an exchange

of views between him and the four American Members of the Commission, a three-day meeting for this purpose being held at Princeton, N.J.

13. Proposals for the reform of the regulations governing the composition and procedure of the Commission : On the suggestion of the Secretary, the Members of the Commission who attended the informal meeting held at Princeton in December 1947 (paragraph 12) gave a special consideration to two matters of great importance to the practical work of the Commission, each of which will, it is known, be raised at the forthcoming Congress in Paris. The subjects in question are :—(i) the composition of the Commission and the method of electing its members ; (ii) the voting procedure of the Commission and in particular the regulations governing the use by the Commission of the Plenary Powers to suspend the normal operation of the *Règles* in certain cases granted to it by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913. There are demands of long-standing for reform under both of the foregoing heads and it is believed that these are substantially met by the proposals formulated at Princeton and now on the point of being submitted to the Congress.

14. Preparations for the forthcoming meeting of the Commission to be held in Paris in July 1948 : Since the return of Mr. Hemming to Europe a series of papers has been prepared for the consideration of the Commission and the Congress when those bodies meet in Paris later this year (1948). Of these papers—to which the Serial Lettering I.C.(48) has been allotted—two (Papers I.C.(48)3 and 4) set out the recommendations relating respectively to the composition of the Commission and the reform of its procedure drafted at Princeton to which reference has already been made. Paper I.C.(48)5 contains a Report on the meaning to be attached to the expression " nomenclature binaire " as used in the *Règles* which has been prepared in response to an invitation extended to the Commission by the Lisbon Congress in 1935 (1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 45). This is a matter which perhaps more than any other has given rise to dissension among zoologists and to confusion in the literature ; its settlement by the forthcoming Congress would by itself be a signal contribution to the cause of stability in nomenclature. The Number I.C.(48)2 has been allotted to the present Report. The other papers are concerned with various matters touching on the possible clarification, amendment or extension of the *Règles* in directions where experience has shown or at least suggested that such action is desirable[6].

---

[6] Ultimately twenty-one papers were circulated in the I.C.(48) Series. With the exception of Paper I.C.(48)2 (the Paper Number allotted to the present Report) the documents circulated in Paris in the above Series were published in 1950 in Volume 3 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (: 1–154). As then explained (*ibid.* **3** : 5, Editorial Footnote), it was decided that, as the present Report had been submitted separately to the International Congress of Zoology in Paris and that Congress had itself given directions for that document to be published, it would be more appropriate to include it in Volume 5 of the *Bulletin* (the volume reserved for the publication of documents, as to the disposal of which decisions had been taken individually by the Congress) than in Volume 3 (the volume reserved for the publication of Papers circulated to the Commission for consideration).

15. The preparation of such papers and their circulation as a basis for discussion at the meetings of the Commission and of the Section on Nomenclature represent a new development in procedure and one which it is believed will facilitate the discharge of business to the general satisfaction of zoologists interested in matters of zoological nomenclature.

Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

FRANCIS HEMMING

Secretariat of the Commission,
London, England.

15*th July* 1948.

APPENDIX 1

The " Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939 " and the " Directions " issued thereunder

[Not Reproduced]

APPENDIX 2

" Opinions " and " Declarations " rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period 1936–1948, including " Opinions " re-issued in annotated form

Titles and Bibliographical References

[Not Reproduced]

APPENDIX 3

Accounts of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the years 1945 and 1946

Page

Part A : Accounts for the Year 1945

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1945 178–179
Income and Expenditure Accounts for the Year 1945 180–181

Part B : Accounts for the Year 1946

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1946 182–183
Income and Expenditure Accounts for the Year 1946 184–185

APPENDIX 4

Accounts of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature for the Years 1947 and 1948

Page

Part A : Accounts for the Year 1947

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1947 186–187
Income and Expenditure Account for the Year 1947 188–189

Part B : Accounts for the Year 1948

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1948 190–191
Income and Expenditure Account for the Year 1948 192–193

APPENDIX 3

ACCOUNTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL

Part A. Accounts
Balance Sheet at

LIABILITIES	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Sundry Creditors			459 11 3
Excess of Assets over Liabilities—			
International Fund No. 1			
As at 31st December 1944	275 4 5		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	6 3 10		
		281 8 3	
International Fund No. 2			
As at 31st December 1944	219 8 7		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	133 7 7		
		352 16 2	
"Official List" Suspense Account			
As at 31st December 1944	120 0 0		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	80 0 0		
		200 0 0	
"International Code (Publications)" Suspense Account			
As at 31st December 1944	100 0 0		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	200 0 0		
		300 0 0	
			1,134 4
			£1,593 15

We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Income and Expenditure Account verified the balance at the bank.

224, Regent Street,
London, W 1.

16*th February* 1946.

OMENCLATURE FOR THE YEARS 1945 AND 1946

r the Year 1945

st December 1945

ASSETS

	£	s.	d.
UNDRY DEBTORS FOR PUBLICATIONS Valued at	218	10	1
ASH AT BANK AND IN HAND ... ... (Stock of Publications not valued)	1,375	5	7

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and Accounting Officer to the International Funds

	£1,593	15	8

n the books and vouchers of the Commission and certify same to be in accordance therewith. We have

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

APPENDIX 3, Part A (*contd.*) [International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature]

Income and Expenditure Accounts for

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
		International
To Sales of Publications—		
Opinions and Declarations	646 15 8	
Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	183 0 10	
		829 16 6
,, Transfer from International Fund No. 2		228 19 0
		£1,058 15 6
		International
To Donations		513 7 7
		£513 7 7
		"Official List"
To Transfer from International Fund No. 1		£80 0 0
		"International Code (Pub
To Transfer from International Fund No. 2		151 1
,, Transfer from International Fund No. 1		48 19
		£200 0

ıe Year ended 31st December 1945

EXPENDITURE

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
ınd No. 1		
y Administration Expenditure—		
Remuneration of Publications Clerk	75 5 0	
Postage	25 7 10	
Miscellaneous Printing and Stationery and Sundry Expenses ...	20 0 8	
Audit Fee	2 2 0	
		122 15 6
Cost of Printing Publications—		
Opinions and Declarations	665 3 5	
Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	135 13 9	
		800 17 2
Transfer to " Official List " (Suspense Account)		80 0 0
Transfer to " International Code (Publications) " Suspense Account		48 19 0
Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet ...		6 3 10
		£1,058 15 6
nd No. 2		
Transfer to " International Code (Publications) " Suspense Account		151 1 0
Transfer to International Fund No. 1		228 19 0
Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet ...		133 7 7
		£513 7 7
ıpense Account)		
Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet ...		£80 0 0
ions) " Suspense Account		
Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet ...		200 0 0
		£200 0 0

APPENDIX 3 (*contd.*) [International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature]

Part B. Accounts

Balance Sheet a

LIABILITIES

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d
CREDITORS			
Estimated cost of Publications in course of preparation		223 12 3	
Sundry Amounts		68 12 4	
			292 4
EXCESS OF ASSETS OVER LIABILITIES—			
International Fund No. 1:			
As at 31st December 1945	281 8 3		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	242 15 6	524 3 9	
International Fund No. 2:			
As at 31st December 1945	352 16 2		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	242 16 6	595 12 8	
"Official List" Suspense Account:			
As at 31st December 1945	200 0 0		
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure for year to date	100 0 0	300 0 0	
"International Code (Publications)" Suspense Account:			
As at 31st December 1945		300 0 0	
Office Equipment Account:			
Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account for year		8 16 8	
			1,728 13
			£2,020 17

We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Income and Expenditure Accoun verified the balance at the bank.

FINSBURY CIRCUS HOUSE,
BLOMFIELD STREET,
LONDON, E.C.2.
25*th November* 1947.

or the Year 1946
31st December 1946

ASSETS

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Office Equipment:		
Expenditure during Year	38 6 9	
Less Amount written off for Year	3 16 8	
		34 10 1
Debtors for Publications—Valued at		188 11 1
Balance at Bank and Cash in Hand		1,797 16 6
(Stock of Publications not valued)		

FRANCIS HEMMING

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and Accounting Officer to the International Funds

£2,020 17 8

vth the books and vouchers of the Commission and certify same to be in accordance therewith. We have

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

APPENDIX 3, Part B (*contd.*) [International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature]

Income and Expenditure Accounts for

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
		International
To Sales of Publications—		
Opinions and Declarations	399 9 11	
Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	139 6 0	
		538 15 11
		£538 15 11
		Internationa
To Donations		342 16
		£342 16
		"Official List"
To Transfer from International Fund No. 2		£100 0
		Office Equi
To Transfer from International Fund No. 1		12 13
		£12 13

the Year ended 31st December 1946

EXPENDITURE

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Fund No. 1		
By Administration Expenditure—		
Remuneration of Publications Clerk	90 0 0	
Postage	18 11 9	
Miscellaneous Printing and Stationery and Sundry Expenses ...	57 10 8	
Transfer to Office Equipment Account	12 13 4	
Audit Fee 1945 and 1946	16 16 0	
		195 11 9
,, Cost of Printing Publications—		
Opinions and Declarations	100 8 8	
Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	– – –	
		100 8 8
,, Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet ...		242 15 6
		£538 15 11
Fund No. 2		
By Transfer to " Official List " (Suspense Account)		100 0 0
,, Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet		242 16 6
		£342 16 6
uspense Account		
By Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet		£100 0 0
ient Account		
By Amount written off Office Equipment for Year		3 16 8
,, Balance carried to Balance Sheet		8 16 8
		£12 13 4

APPENDIX 4

ACCOUNTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL

(A body incorporated 5th February 1947 under the

Part A. Accounts

Balance Sheet at

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Revenue Reserves (per Separate Accounts)—		
"Official List" Suspense Account	550 0 0	
"International Code (Publications)" Suspense Account	300 0 0	
Office Equipment Reserve	97 16 8	
		947 16 8
Income and Expenditure Account Balance		1,142 6 7
		2,090 3 3
Creditors		613 11 1
		£2,703 14 4

We have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of our knowledge and belief were from our examination of those books. We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Income our information and according to the explanations given us, the said accounts give the information required by the Trust's affairs at 31st December, 1947, and the Income and Expenditure Account gives a true and fair view of the

Finsbury Circus House,
Blomfield Street,
London, E.C.2.
27*th July* 1949.

IOMENCLATURE FOR THE YEARS 1947 AND 1948

Companies Act, 1929 (Limited by Guarantee))

or the Year 1947

1st December 1947

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
IXED ASSETS—		
Office Equipment:		
Book value as at 31st December 1946 as shown by the books of the Commission	34 10 1	
Add Additions during year	89 15 11	
	124 6 0	
Less Depreciation for year	12 8 6	111 17 6
URRENT ASSETS—		
Amounts due for Publications—valued at	100 0 0	
Estimated amount receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.	1,020 0 0	
Balance at Bank and Cash in Hand	1,471 16 10	2,591 16 10

NOTE.—Stock of Publications not valued.

FRANCIS HEMMING
A. S. PANKHURST
} *Members of the Committee of Management*

£2,703 14 4

essary for the purpose of our audit. In our opinion proper books of account have been kept, so far as appears al Expenditure Account, which are in agreement with the books of account. In our opinion and to the best of Companies Act, 1948 in the manner so required, and the Balance Sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of the Excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended at that date.

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

APPENDIX 4, Part A (*contd.*) [International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature]

Income and Expenditure Account for

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
To Sales of Publications—		
Opinions and Declarations	408 16 4	
Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	187 0 3	
		595 16 7
„ Donations		294 10 11
„ Grant by Smithsonian Institution towards Travelling Expenses ($750)		187 10 0
„ Estimated Grant receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.	1,020 0 0	
Less Transfer to Office Equipment Reserve	89 0 0	
		931 0 0
		£2,008 17 6
„ Balance brought down being Excess of Income over Expenditure for year		597 4 8
„ Balances of International Funds at 31st December, 1946 as shown by the books of the Commission:		
Fund No. 1	524 3 9	
Fund No. 2	595 12 8	
		1,119 16 8
		£1,717 1 1

"Official List"

To Balance carried to Balance Sheet	550 0 0
	£500 0 0

"International Code (Public

To Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£300 0

Office Equi

To Balance carried to Balance Sheet	97 16
	£97 16

he Year ended 31st December 1947

EXPENDITURE

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
By Administration Expenses—			
Salaries:			
Assistant Director	253 15 3		
Publications Officer	170 10 2		
		424 5 5	
Travelling Expenses	... ...	550 17 3	
Office Expenses	... ...	204 19 10	
Audit Fee	... ...	21 0 0	
			1,201 2 6
,, Depreciation of Office Equipment	... ...		12 8 6
,, Publications—Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	... ...		198 1 10
,, Balance carried down	... ...		597 4 8
			£2,008 17 6
y Formation Expenses	... ...	... ...	324 14 6
., Transfer to " Official List " Suspense Account	... ...	... ...	250 0 0
, Balance carried to Balance Sheet	... ...	... ...	1,142 6 7
			£1,717 1 1

ispense Account

y Balance at 31st December 1946 as shown by the books of the Commission	300 0 0
. Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account	250 0 0
	£550 0 0

ns) " Suspense Account

Balance at 31st December 1946 as shown by the books of the Commission	£300 0 0

nt Reserve

Balance at 31st December 1946 as shown by the books of the Commission	8 16 8
Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account—Estimated Grant receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.	89 0 0
	£97 16 8

APPENDIX 4 (*contd.*) [International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature]

Part B. Accounts

Balance Sheet a

1947 £	£		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d
		REVENUE RESERVES (per SEPARATE ACCOUNTS)—						
	550	"Official List" Suspense Account	550	0	0			
	300	"International Code (Publications)" Suspense Account	–	–	–			
	98	Office Equipment Reserve	97	16	8			
948						647	16	8
1,142		INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT BALANCE—				669	16	4
2,090						1,317	13	0
		PROVISION FOR COST OF REVISION OF INTERNATIONAL CODE—						
—		"International Code (Publications)" Suspense Account—per Separate Account				800	0	0
614		CREDITORS	1,385	19	0			
—		GRANT BY U.N.E.S.C.O. UNSPENT (estimated) ...	2,673	9	4			
						4,059	8	4
£2,704						£6,177	1	

We have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of our knowledge and belief wer from our examination of those books. We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Incom our information and according to the explanations given us, the said accounts give the information required by th Trust's affairs at 31st December, 1948, and the Income and Expenditure Account gives a true and fair view of th

FINSBURY CIRCUS HOUSE,
BLOMFIELD STREET,
LONDON, E.C.2.
27th July 1949.

or the Year 1948

31st December 1948

1947			£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
£	£							
		FIXED ASSETS—						
		Office Equipment:						
		Book Value at 31st December 1947	111	17	6			
112		*Less* Depreciation for year	11	3	6			
						100	14	0
		CURRENT ASSETS—						
-	*100*	Amounts due for Publications valued at	50	0	0			
	1,020	Estimated Amount receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.	–	–	–			
2,592	*1,472*	Balance at Bank and Cash in Hand	6,026	7	4			
						6,076	7	4
		NOTE.—Stock of Publications not valued.						

FRANCIS HEMMING
A. S. PANKHURST
} *Members of the Committee of Management.*

2,704

£6,177 1 4

essary for the purpose of our audit. In our opinion proper books of account have been kept, so far as appears l Expenditure Account, which are in agreement with the books of account. In our opinion and to the best of mpanies Act, 1948 in the manner so required, and the Balance Sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of the cess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended at that date.

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

APPENDIX 4, Part B (*contd.*) [International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature]

Income and Expenditure Account for

1947 £	£			£ s. d.	£ s. d.
			INCOME		
		To	Sales of Publications—		
	409		Opinions and Declarations	126 6 5	
	187		Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ...	48 10 10	
596					174 17 3
294		,,	Donations		27 8 1
188		,,	Grant by Smithsonian Institution towards Travelling Expenses		– – –
931		,,	Estimated Grant receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.		1,496 0 0
£2,009					£1,698 5 4
597		To	Balance brought down being Excess of Income over Expenditure for year		27 9 9
1,120		,,	Balance of International Funds at 31st December 1946		– – –
—		,,	Balance at 31st December 1947 brought forward		1,142 6 7
£1,717					£1,169 16 4

"Official List"

550	To	Balance carried to Balance Sheet		550 0 0
£550				£550 0 0

Office Equip

98	To	Balance carried to Balance Sheet		97 16 8
£98				£97 16 8

"International Code (Public

300	To	Balance carried to Balance Sheet		800 0 0
£300				£800 0 0

ne Year ended 31st December 1948

1947 £	1947 £	EXPENDITURE	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
		By Administration Expenses—			
		Salaries :			
254		Assistant Director	109 17 5		
170		Publications Officer ...	175 1 4		
—		Stenographer Secretary ...	29 0 4		
424				313 19 1	
551		Travelling Expenses		123 17 9	
205		Office Expenses		196 10 3	
21		Audit Fee		21 0 0	
1,201					655 7 1
13		,, Depreciation of Office Equipment			11 3 6
198		,, Publications—Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature			1,004 5 0
597		,, Balance carried down			27 9 9
2,009					£1,698 5 4
325		By Formation Expenses			— — —
250		,, Transfer to Official List Suspense Account ...			— — —
—		,, Transfer to International Code (Publications) Suspense Account towards cost of Revision of International Code			500 0 0
1,142		,, Balance carried to Balance Sheet			669 16 4
1,717					£1,169 16 4

spense Account

300	By Balance at 31st December 1947	550 0 0	
250	,, Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account	— — —	
£550		£550 0 0	

nt Reserve

9	By Balance at 31st December 1947	97 16 8	
89	,, Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account —Estimated Grant receivable from U.N.E.S.C.O.	— — —	
£98		£97 16 8	

ins)" Suspense Account

300	By Balance at 31st December 1947	300 0 0	
	,, Transfer from Income and Expenditure Account	500 0 0	
300		£800 0 0	

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part* (*pages*)	*Date of Publication*
1/3	[Preliminary] T.P.–xxii Half-Title for Part I of Volume (1)–62	7th July 1950
4/6	63–168	7th July 1950
7	169–194 T.P.–(IV)	9th June 1959

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDERS

The present volume should be bound up as follows :—T.P. [published 1959]–(IV) ; [Preliminary] T.P. [published 1950]–[ii]–iii–[iv]–v–[vi]–vii–[viii]–ix–xxi–[1 blank] ; Half Title for Part 1 of volume [published 1950]–[1 blank], (1)–2–194.

Note :—The wrappers (covers) of the three units (Parts 1/3, 4/6, 7) in which this volume was published should be bound in at the end of the volume.

© 1959. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E

2/ HL/-
118